

When the name of Lee is mentioned to the unprejudiced, at once he is associated with the great generals of all time. We link him with Alexander the Great, Caesar, Napoleon, Washington, Jackson, and a few others. Born the son of a distinguished Revolutionary soldier, his scholarly attainments at West Point made his recall there as superintendent a natural sequence. While he at first opposed secession with such means available to him as an Army officer and was offered the supreme field command of the United States Army, he, nevertheless, through loyalty and devotion to his native Virginia resigned his commission and became the leader of all the southern forces. His ability and leadership was demonstrated under General Scott in the War with Mexico. While he may have resisted to the bitter end, his regard for the welfare of his men, his beloved Southland and her future caused him to tender his sword to Grant at Appomattox on April 9, 1865. His greatness, his humility, and his reverence for the things eternal are reflected in his final order to his troops which he issued on the following day of April 10, 1865. His words in that order were:

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY OF
NORTHERN VIRGINIA,
April 10, 1865.

After 4 years of arduous service, marked by unsurpassed courage and fortitude, the Army of Northern Virginia has been compelled to yield to overwhelming numbers and resources. I need not tell the survivors of so many hard-fought battles, who have remained steadfast to the last, that I have consented to this result from no distrust of them; but, feeling that valor and devotion could accomplish nothing that could compensate for the loss that would have attended the continuation of the contest, I have determined to avoid the useless sacrifice of those whose past services have endeared them to their countrymen. By the terms of the agreement, officers and men can return to their homes and remain there until exchanged. You will take with you the satisfaction that proceeds from the consciousness of duty faithfully performed; and I earnestly pray that a merciful God will extend to you His blessing and protection. With an increasing admiration of your constancy and devotion to your country, and a grateful remembrance of your kind and generous consideration of myself, I bid you an affectionate farewell.

R. E. LEE, General.

The eloquent tribute to the bravery and devotion of his men were expressed in Lee's last order to his troops. His affection for them and consideration for their future led to the cessation of hostilities.

Matthew Fontaine Maury, of Fredericksburg, Va., having been educated at the United States Naval Academy, became an officer in the United States Navy. Historians say he was trained to the sea. After a few years, due to an accident, he retired but continued his devotion to naval affairs as a civilian. His worldwide fame was achieved at a conference in Brussels in 1855. This resulted in his restoration to active naval service as a commander. He had distinguished himself as head of the United States Naval Observatory and Hydrographic Office. His authorship of the Physical Geography of the Sea, Wind and Currents Charts, and other meteorological works resulted in the renown for him in his day as the world's most distinguished oceanographer and hydrographer. When the War Between the States began, he resigned his command in the Navy of the United States and assumed the harbor defenses of the meager southern navy. Upon the close of the war, he retired to Lexington as the professor of meteorology at the Virginia Military Institute. By training, study, and excellence in naval affairs we are happy to acclaim him as one of the leading naval authorities of our country and particularly of the Southland.

Thomas Jonathan Jackson, one of the most daring and successful military tacticians ever to wear a soldier's uniform was much younger than either Lee or Maury. From Clarksburg, then a part of Virginia, he entered and graduated from West Point. He gave evidence early in life of his military genius. His army career with the United States was of rather short duration, for we find him as military instructor at Virginia Military Institute when hostilities began. He became a colonel in the Virginia Militia and soon rose to the rank of brigadier and major general. His achievements, his courage, and valor have become the topics of discussion among military men of all succeeding generations. His surprise attacks and sudden exploits in the Shenandoah Valley confounded and surprised the Union forces to the extent that Jackson soon had the reputation of being the ablest of Lee's generals. While a strict disciplinarian, he was an ardent Calvinist and a devout Christian. His troops loved him for his genius, his abilities, and his personal worth. General Lee once said that had he had the services of Jackson at Gettysburg, the outcome there would have been different.

To praise these men is not to minimize others; nor does that praise detract from the respect and admiration, for the rank and file of our men and women; yea the debt, we shall never be able to pay.

Defeats and sorrows give us a better nature. They add to our resourcefulness. In

crises we surprise ourselves with what can be accomplished. I am indebted to the great minister who conducts the national pulpit of the air on Sunday mornings for the thought that in despair and reverses that Dante wrote his masterpiece. John Milton wrote his greatest work when blindness had fallen upon him. Tennyson, in struggle for light during his sorrow over the death of a friend, gave us his great In Memoriam. Continuing, Doctor Sockman said:

"Dr. Edwin Mims, of Vanderbilt University, once declared that Robert E. Lee did more for the South in the 5 years after his surrender at Appomattox than during the 5 years he was so brilliantly leading his troops. He took the leadership of a college in Virginia and with no rancor of spirit, he manifested a magnanimity and nobility which made him revered in the South and respected throughout the whole Nation."

While we could spend hours rehearsing the lives and deeds of any one of the three whom we honor tonight, vain would be our proceedings unless from "Defeat we receive its dividends." Surely the morale of the human race has been lifted more by those who have courageously borne their defeats than those whom success have ever attended. The inspiration of these lives to our fathers and mothers are ours to transmit to our children and they to theirs. In complete succession we shall ever keep fresh in the minds and hearts of our people the measure of gratitude to these illustrious men of our past. Back of me on the wall of my office is an almost life-size picture of Robert E. Lee. As I gaze upon it, my spirit from day to day is refreshed by thought and hope that in defeat, sorrow, and surrender comes crowning achievements if we will but persist in the right. So my friends, it is well that you have dedicated yourselves to carrying on in the paths your parents treaded. Surely, the joy, the happiness and blessings which are ours shall then increase for all. The faith of our fathers and mothers must remain with us as a constant reminder. In that faith, sustained by the influence of the Supreme Being are born the virtues of our existence exalted in the lines:

"God in all His glory rules

Watching over us with care

He sends us wisdom, love and truth

With his fellowman to share."

To Lee, Maury, and Jackson, representative as they are of all that is noble in a cause dear to their hearts, we of the South must never cease to acknowledge our debt of gratitude and appreciation. Their names as symbols of many others must ever be spoken of in reverence. To remember them is both an opportunity and a pleasure. To you and me it shall ever be a sacred duty.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, in the white light of whose presence all our motives stand revealed, for this hallowed moment, turning from our divisive loyalties and our party cries, we would bow humbly in a unity of spirit with a vivid realization of our oneness in Thee. Closing the door of prayer upon the outer world, with its tumult and shouting and its unpredictable trends, and bowing now in the searching light of Thy holiness, we know ourselves for what we are, petty and proud creatures who too often seek their own

will and whims in spite of the polished courtesies and noble professions with which we come to Thee.

Cleanse the inner fountains of our hearts from all defiling foulness and from the secret sin of pretense. In tense days, when the words that are uttered here may affect the uttermost parts of the earth, fit us faithfully to protect the Republic from outward aggression and subversion and from the treason of inner selfishness. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 10, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the part of the House, Mr. DURHAM, of North Carolina; Mr. HOLIFIELD, of California; Mr. PRICE, of Illinois; Mr. KILDAY, of Texas; Mr. DEMPSEY, of New Mexico; Mr. COLE, of New York; Mr. HINSHAW, of California; Mr. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. PATTERSON, of Connecticut.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL LEGISLATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—(H. DOC. NO. 66)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to Federal personnel legislation, which was read and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we have heard the President's message, recommending the enactment of legislation which would further improve the position of Government career employees. This message includes recommendations for increased pay, adjustments in pay scales, group health insurance, employee training, personnel practices affecting Government employees stationed overseas, and increased travel allowances.

It is my sincere hope that we may obtain early consideration of this proposed legislation, and favorable action on the part of the Senate and the House of Representatives. In my opinion, the Federal employees merit these proposed recommendations.

Last evening I was presented a citation by the Federal Club for outstanding service to the career employees of the Federal Government. The membership of the Federal Club is composed of men in responsible career positions in the Federal Government. This was a great honor, and was greatly appreciated by me.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a copy of the citation.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In recognition of outstanding services rendered to the common weal in civic, State, and Federal activities, in his professional and legislative career, and for his vigorous advocacy of the improvement of the quality and public recognition of the integrity of the career service, and for fostering of the welfare of Federal civilian personnel, the Federal Club, Inc., hereby confers its honor award citation on the Honorable FRANK CARLSON.

In testimony whereof there is affixed the seal of the Federal Club, Inc., and the signature of the president, the secretary, and the chairman of the awards committee this 13th day of December 1954.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the speech I made on receiving the award, and I ask that it be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CARLSON

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and my good friends and members of the Federal Club. I shall long remember the gracious remarks which accompanied the presentation of this wonderful award by the Federal Club. When I think of the distinguished public figures who have received this annual award from your fine organization, I realize your great kindness to me. I shall cherish this honor and I will keep faith with you.

At the outset, I wish to commend the Federal Club for its many contributions to our Government service. Your members have been responsible for developing ideas which have helped maintain our Federal service in the respected place it occupies among the governments of the world. Over the years you have been complimented by chief executives of the Nation and other high public officials. I wish to add my commendation to the many richly deserved compliments you have already received.

For over a quarter of a century I have served the people of my State in the House of Representatives, as Governor of Kansas, and as a Member of the United States Senate. In all of this public service I have firmly believed in a merit civil-service system for public employees.

In the capacity of chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the past 2 years I worked for the improvement of the Federal civil service. I will continue to work toward securing fair and just benefits for Federal employees in the future as I have in the past.

Under the leadership of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, the past 2 years have been great milestones on the road of civil service progress.

Federal employees have secured benefits and privileges which they have strived for years to obtain.

Upon recommendation of the President the Congress last year approved low-cost life insurance and unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

I introduced legislation which became known as the fringe benefits bill. Following the hearings when our committee considered the views of Federal employees organizations and the endorsements of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget, this bill was approved and became law. In my opinion, it is one of the most progressive laws to improve the civil-service system which has been enacted in recent years.

Among the important provisions contained in this law are: a more realistic overtime pay structure; authority to pay above the minimum rates in grades where competition with private industry requires additional compensation to attract well-qualified Federal employees; the repeal of the restrictive provisions of the so-called Whitten amendment which have interfered with necessary civil-service reforms; a uniform allowance for Federal employees who are required to wear uniforms in connection with their official duties; and a more effective incentive awards program for Federal employees under which initiative and contributions to the public service by Federal employees are recognized through higher monetary awards to individual employees.

For retired Federal employees the last Congress provided for making permanent temporary annuity increases and under the tax law which was approved—retired Federal employees are granted a generous exemption. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, it was a pleasure to assist in writing and securing approval of this legislation.

I was the author of the pay-increase bill for Federal and postal employees which was approved by the Congress but vetoed by the President. I believed that bill was fair to all Federal employees and it is my earnest hope that at an early date the Congress will pass similar legislation which will be approved by the President.

Tomorrow, January 11, President Eisenhower will send a special message to the Congress outlining his views with respect to a proposed salary adjustment for Federal and postal employees. From what I have learned, this proposal will not differ materially from my bill which was approved by the Congress last summer.

Federal employees deserve a salary adjustment because for many positions the salaries

paid Federal employees are substantially less than those paid for similar work in private industry. While I recognize that Government salaries in top-level positions will never be comparable to salaries paid persons in private industry for similar work, yet I think the Government owes an obligation to all of the people of the United States to make certain that its employees are treated as fairly as possible within a reasonable budget.

In my opinion, the cost of such a pay adjustment and the cost of other fringe benefits which were approved during the last Congress are necessary and vital operating costs of conducting the business of the finest Government in the world.

I look upon these expenditures as an investment, an investment in the future of America. Those who devote their working years to public service are entitled to at least two things: First, reasonable security with an expectation of adequate retirement benefits; and, second, adequate compensation for the work performed as well as entitlement to those fringe benefits now enjoyed by most workers in private industry. Federal employees demand no more and the people of our Nation expect no less for those persons who conduct the day-by-day affairs of our Government.

During my service in Congress I have had an opportunity to know and cherish the friendship of many hundreds of Federal employees. From the many things they have told me about their problems, I know that there is more to their work than is generally realized by the public outside our Nation's Capital.

First, I know the zeal and integrity with which they approach their daily work; I know that the overwhelming majority are loyal to our country. The vast majority are not concerned with politics and they readily adapt themselves to whatever changes in Government the American people decide.

It is these thousands upon thousands of Federal employees who are responsible for the continuity of Government operations through good years and bad years, war and peace, depression and prosperity.

It is for these reasons that I cannot consider Federal employees in terms of statistics, personnel actions, 201 files or pieces of paper.

We have made great progress in many fields relating to personnel administration which has produced a better civil-service system. But there remains yet a vast unexplored field which relates to the important functions of proper placement, improved training programs, management-employee relations, executive development, recruiting methods, promotion policies, and a host of other factors which daily affect the lives and futures of Federal employees and their families.

It is in this relatively unexplored and uncharted sea that remains in the future's challenge to all of us to make greater progress and to obtain improvements.

This is why I feel that we must devote our energies and attention to the improvement of the individual dignity of each Federal employee, and make certain each employee understands the role he plays in the important activities of Government. It will be from this new sense of pride in a job well done and the fact that each employee will understand the part he plays in making our Government strong, that the true measure of Federal employee morale will be determined in the future.

In spite of the outstanding record of the last Congress toward improving the civil-service system and providing liberal benefits for Federal employees, there are those who contend that Federal employee morale has suffered during the past 2 years. Nothing could be further from the truth. The recent election did not demonstrate that Federal employees are dissatisfied with the record of the Congress or of the administration. As a matter of fact, I believe the rank

and file of Federal employees consider themselves as having received as fair treatment during the past 2 years as at any other time in history. I believe, too, that these charges of lowered employee morale are based on political considerations. They have no substance.

In my opinion, the President will submit legislative proposals to the Congress within a short time to raise further the standard of the Federal service and to provide additional benefits for Federal employees. In addition to the pay adjustments which will be requested tomorrow, I believe the President will submit proposals strengthening the new life-insurance program and providing health insurance for Federal employees. From time to time during the session additional legislative proposals will be submitted to Congress strengthening the civil-service system generally which will react to the benefit of all Federal employees.

During the past few months there has been considerable discussion in regard to the dismissal of Federal employees for security reasons and rumors are current that the new Congress, under new leadership, will initiate an investigation of the entire security program.

Permit me to observe that I do not oppose any honest inquiry or study which will be productive or result in a better civil-service system.

I know that nothing has been done during the past 2 years in the executive branch that requires concealment from the public.

President Eisenhower is surrounded by an excellent group of able and conscientious public officials. They have been fair and honest with the people of the United States. I would consider it shameful if the present congressional leadership would seek to initiate any kind of investigation which would tend to destroy the progress which has been made or will use their present authority for partisan political demagoguery.

I am and have always been a strong supporter of the true merit system, but I desire to differentiate between that and the equally illustrious group of those in policymaking positions. I have always felt that to aid the administration in power all of this latter group should be selected carefully by the administration so that the philosophy of that administration would be implemented throughout the entire Government.

I believe everyone must agree that the administration in power is entitled to and must have men and women in key positions whose thinking is attuned to that of those in authority.

We cannot afford the luxury of indulging in political fights of this nature while larger issues involving the maintenance of a sound domestic economy, military preparedness, and a firm foreign policy are of paramount importance.

This month we begin a new year. Most of us here are engaged in the great work of making our Government stronger to resist the dangers inherent in an atheistic philosophy which seeks to engulf and destroy the free nations of the world.

I have thought of what ideals and principles should motivate us during the coming year. I can think of no better description of our point of view than to recall for you a poem written by Walter Reed Hunt, a famous New England church official in the 19th century whose ideas are as appropriate today as they were during his lifetime:

"A MORNING WISH"

"The sun is just rising on the morning of another day, the first day of a new year. What can I wish that this day, this year, may bring to me? Nothing that shall make the world or others poorer, nothing at the expense of other men; but just those few things which in their coming do not stop with me,

but touch me rather, as they pass and gather strength:

"A few friends who understand me, and yet remain my friends.

"A work to do which has real value without which the world would feel the poorer.

"A return for such work small enough not to tax unduly any one who pays.

"A mind unafraid to travel, even though the trail be not blazed.

"An understanding heart.

"A sight of the eternal hills and unresting sea, and of something beautiful the hand of man has made.

"A sense of humor and the power to laugh.

"A little leisure with nothing to do.

"A few moments of quiet, silent meditation. The sense of the presence of God.

"And the patience to wait for the coming of these things, with the wisdom to know them when they come."

LEGISLATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—(H. DOC. NO. 65)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to legislation for postal employees, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

FORMER SENATOR GUY M. GILLETTE—RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, very recently the Young Democratic Club of the State University of Iowa adopted a resolution commending former Senator Guy M. Gillette for his service to the State of Iowa. It gives me considerable pleasure, having served with Senator Gillette for many years, to read this resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of that organization:

Whereas Guy M. Gillette has very ably served the State of Iowa for 16 years in the United States Senate and has been a leader in Congress,

We, the State University of Iowa Young Democrats, extend to Senator Gillette our thanks and appreciation for this faithful service.

DEVELOPMENT OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN CUTOFF—RESOLUTION

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Burlington, Vt., relating to the Lake Champlain cutoff.

I hope very much that the administration will make the necessary investigations as to the cost and usefulness of the proposed cutoff.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution relating to Lake Champlain cutoff

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Burlington, as follows:

Whereas in the past this board has repeatedly expressed its wholehearted support of proposed legislation in the Congress for the development of the Lake Champlain Cutoff in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway project; and

Whereas it is increasingly apparent that the prosperity of this area is becoming more and more dependent upon the enactment of such legislation; Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board hereby requests the active support of such proposed legislation by the members of the Vermont delegation in the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk forward to the members of such delegation a certified copy of this resolution.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON PRODUCTION OF DURUM WHEAT—LETTER FROM WARD COUNTY (N. DAK.) CROP IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter dated December 30, 1954, from the Crop Improvement Association, Ward County Courthouse, Minot, N. Dak., signed by its president, Joe Parizek, dealing with the matter of an increase in acreage in durum wheat and also with the subject of crop insurance.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARD COUNTY CROP
IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
Minot, N. Dak., December 30, 1954.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: The Ward County Crop Improvement Association unanimously adopted the following resolution at a meeting held November 29, 1954:

"Whereas the production of amber durum wheat in the United States during the past 2 years has been approximately one-third of the amount normally consumed; and

"Whereas the available varieties of amber durum wheat are more susceptible to stem rust than hard wheat, the risk involved in raising durum is much greater than for hard wheat; and

"Whereas the cost of amber durum seed is nearly twice that for hard wheat of comparable quality and difficult to secure; and

"Whereas crop insurance is not now available to growers of amber durum in much of the durum producing area of North Dakota, farmers will seed hard wheat instead of durum on their allotted wheat acres, thus the potential supply of amber durum will be further reduced: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Ward County Crop Improvement Association, That the Secretary of Agriculture and the United States Congress be requested to remove all acreage restrictions for seeding amber durum wheat in 1955 to provide an incentive for increasing production of this wheat of which there is a critical shortage."

Sincerely,

JOE PARIZEK,
President.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. 301. A bill to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DANIEL when he introduced the above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 302. A bill amending section 500 of The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 303. A bill to provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 304. A bill authorizing the construction of a highway bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal at Summit, Delaware; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sebastiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 306. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 307. A bill for the relief of Eva Elisabeth Uber English; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 308. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 309. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 310. A bill to require that automobiles introduced into, delivered for introduction into, or operated in, interstate commerce be equipped with safety belts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 311. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 312. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 313. A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses

committed while operating vehicles; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 314. A bill for the relief of Stanley William Wheatland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Asher Ezra-chi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 316. A bill to extend the period within which farmers may file petitions for relief under section 75 (c) of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 317. A bill to supersede certain provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 with respect to the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 318. A bill for the relief of Chih Shing Hwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 319. A bill for the relief of John B. Gibbons, Jr.;

S. 320. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen;

S. 321. A bill for the relief of Anni Margatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela; and

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Malbina Rouphael David, nee Gebrael; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 323. A bill for the relief of Luigi Orlando;

S. 324. A bill for the relief of Vesa Reijo Luukkonen;

S. 325. A bill for the relief of Elvira Tocchio Anzedei;

S. 326. A bill for the relief of Leopoldine Maria Lofblad;

S. 327. A bill for the relief of Joao-Pinguel Rodrigues;

S. 328. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chih Sugiura, Motoko Sugiura, Atsushi Sugiura, and Kumi Sugiura; and

S. 329. A bill for the relief of Jean Jing Peo Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 330. A bill to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 331. A bill for the relief of the city of Baltimore, Md.;

S. 332. A bill for the relief of Hava Shpak, A. A. Shpak, and Sympcha Shpak;

S. 333. A bill to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Union Iron Works; and

S. 334. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tanash H. Atoynatan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 335. A bill to provide for a heliport in the District of Columbia for use in helicopter service between the Friendship International Airport and the downtown area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 336. A bill to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 337. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 338. A bill to establish an effective student exchange program with Latin American countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill for Mr. SMATHERS, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 339. A bill to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill for Mr. SMATHERS, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to assure the equal application of the Constitution and laws of the United States to individuals of both sexes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by me last year in connection with a similar bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 301) to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. DANIEL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

This bill would help to preserve that great portion of the true history of our Nation which is recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and in currently published weekly papers of the United States.

There are many public and private agencies which have preserved the files or the microfilms of our great daily newspapers. They are an excellent primary source of recorded history. However, the full and complete story of our Nation's history and progress cannot be preserved unless we save that which is recorded in the weekly newspapers published throughout the land.

During the early years of our Nation's history we had only weekly newspapers. Even today, the educational, social, political, and religious history of a great portion of our population can be found only in the files of these weekly publications. As a boy I learned to appreciate this fact. My father published weekly newspapers in four different towns of Texas. He left the publishing business in later years, but always retained

and carefully preserved the bound volumes of all issues of his newspapers. First I knew them as carefully guarded family treasures, but later I found that they were a constant source of the history of the communities in which they were published. They are now preserved in the library of one of our leading universities.

There are thousands of weekly newspaper files which have been preserved. Others have been destroyed, and in the future there is likely to be continued loss of this valuable historical material unless something is done to encourage its preservation.

Mr. Garland R. Farmer, owner and publisher of the *Henderson Times* at Henderson, Tex., a weekly newspaperman for over 25 years, saw the need for a national library of weekly newspapers several years ago. With private funds and at his own expense he established such a library and began a nationwide campaign for preservation of weekly newspaper files. His work has inspired me to offer this legislation.

The following is an article written by Mr. Farmer:

"WHY WE NEED THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS"

"For many years this Nation had only weekly newspapers. Even today, the educational, political, social, and religious history of the major part of our people can be found only in the files of these publications.

"As a weekly newspaperman for over 25 years, I learned that little or nothing was being done to preserve this rich store of information, and make it available to all, even though much was being lost every day.

"So I called this neglect to the attention of the Library of Congress, American foundations, historical and press associations, colleges, libraries, and the general public.

"The response was immediate and almost unanimous. They agreed the idea of a National Library of Weekly Newspapers was excellent—should have been started generations ago—but where to get the funds to 'get the show on the road?'

"Not satisfied to allow the campaign to bog down, I started using my own personal funds to set up the National Library of Weekly Newspapers here in Henderson. About 96 percent of the services and contacts are by mail, so location of the library is not important.

"Too, it is one of the primary functions of this library to work with and through press and historical associations; State, college, and local libraries to encourage and assist the 48 States in setting up their own programs to preserve this vital store of historical information. The job is too big for one organization, but one organization is needed for the overall work.

"With the financial aid of a few other firms and individuals, I have this program on a national and nonprofit basis, but the problem is one that involves everyone—even you. The burden should not be borne by one or just a few.

"So, I am offering to turn all my accumulated data, microfilmed weeklies, cabinets, files, etc., to the Federal Government, if only a staff of three is provided to carry on the work.

"My program has been strongly endorsed by such colleges as: Stanford, Florida State, University of Texas, Columbia, Michigan, Iowa, Missouri, and so on across the Nation.

"Students, teachers, and historians say the work has already been neglected too long. Leaders of both major political parties, in and out of Congress, say they are ready to act, and asked me to draw up a bill which could help at a minimum cost.

"That makes good sense, for there are over 8,000 weekly newspapers in the United States, and their readers elect 75 percent of the United States Senators and 61 percent of our Representatives.

"This letter, with enclosures, should give you a fair picture of the need, which has been neglected too long.

"Cordially,

"GARLAND R. FARMER,
"Henderson (Tex.) Times."

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S RE-ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Alabama may proceed.

The bill (S. 302) amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the bill I have introduced will extend the life of the GI loan program which first was authorized by the Congress in title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. It is my hope that this bill will receive the wholehearted support it so richly deserves. If the GI loan program is not continued millions of our World War II veterans will fail to share in this benefit.

Under the GI loan program of the Veterans' Administration the generous terms of GI financing are made available by private banks, savings and loan associations, insurance companies, and other investors, since the partial guaranty of VA encourages the lenders to make loans at moderate interest rates and on very liberal credit terms. Most GI loans are made with no downpayment, or with a much smaller cash downpayment requirement than is normally required by a lender, and a maximum maturity of 30 years is permissible.

The Veterans' Administration has underwritten nearly 3,900,000 loans made to veterans by these private lending institutions. More than 3,600,000 were made for the purchase or construction of homes, 218,000 were business loans and another 67,000 were made in connection with farming activity. The dollar volume of closed loans is in excess of \$26½ billion with the VA guaranty or insurance in excess of \$14 billion. More than 760,000 of these loans have been paid in full, and it is estimated that the outstanding loan balances total about \$19.3 billion on which the Government's contingent liability amounts to approximately \$10.6 billion.

The repayment record which our veterans have maintained is little short of astounding. The VA has been called upon to pay a total of 34,000 claims, which represents less than 1 percent of all loans closed. In the case of home loans the VA has been called upon to pay claims on about one-half of 1 percent of the cases. This fine record is a tribute not only to the individual vet-

erans, but also demonstrates the care with which the loans were made by the private lending institutions and the diligent manner in which they were serviced.

And now let us consider how expensive this program has been to the Government. The largest single cost item to the Government to date has been the gratuity payment which was in an amount equal to 4 percent of the guaranteed or insured portion of the loans. The gratuity was limited to \$160 for each veteran and the payments totaled slightly more than \$400 million. However, this gratuity has not been paid on any loans approved after September 1, 1953. A total of about \$125 million has been expended in connection with claims and the purchase of properties incident to the salvage operation. Of this amount about \$61.5 million represents claim payments and the balance was disbursed in acquiring properties, purchasing loans where foreclosure was imminent and other property management and sales expenses involved in liquidation. Of the \$125 million gross expenditure, more than \$41.5 million has been returned to the Treasury from property sales and rentals, from recoveries on claim payments, and from principal and interest payments on properties sold on credit terms and acquired loans. In addition, there are assets on hand, comprised of the balances due from properties sold on terms and acquired loans, totaling about \$53 million, and unsold properties on hand valued at about \$12 million. Thus the assets together with the funds already returned to the Treasury total \$106.5 million, and in addition there is \$23.5 million due from veterans and others as a result of the guaranty payments. When we consider that more than 3½ million veterans have gotten started down the road toward debt-free home ownership, or helped in their business or farm endeavors, the price truly has been small. There is nothing which will contribute more to the preservation of our American way of life than making it possible for people to own their own homes or to assist energetic young people in getting started in a farm or business operation. The whole Nation has gained by reason of the increased stability and civic responsibility which necessarily follows from the establishment of vast numbers of veterans' families in their own homes, which never could have been attained without the benefits of the preferential financing terms of the GI loan.

The GI loan program for World War II veterans will terminate on July 25, 1957. Veterans of the Korean conflict will have 10 years from the recently established January 31, 1955, cutoff date, and my bill will have no application to them. However, there still are about 11 million eligible veterans with World War II service only who have not made any use of their GI loan benefit, and most of those who have made use of their entitlement have a substantial amount remaining which may be used for the purchase, construction, or repair of residential property. It has been estimated that between one and three million more veterans of World War II will

not be able to take advantage of their GI loan rights if we allow this law to expire on July 25, 1957. This would mean that between eight and ten million World War II veterans would not, for one reason or another, have been able to obtain the benefit Congress intended for them. Many have held off buying in the belief that there would be a general leveling off so that they could better project their future plans. Others found that there was a general unavailability of mortgage money when they endeavored to obtain their loans.

Furthermore, when the original 10-year limitation was imposed we had no way of foretelling that there would be an additional disruption in our economy made necessary by the action we were forced to take in Korea. This had the natural consequence of upsetting the timetable of many World War II veterans even though they were not called upon to return to active duty. In addition, for a period of nearly 3 years credit controls were imposed which required that cash payments of substantial amounts be made in some cases and that the maximum maturities be shortened. In all fairness to these veterans they should be afforded a further opportunity to take advantage of their GI loan benefits in order to compensate for the general upheaval caused in our economy by the Korean conflict.

We also should consider carefully the industrial impact which the GI loan program has had and the consequences which would result from its discontinuance. All of us are aware of the large part played by the construction industry in maintaining high economic levels during the past several years. During the past year it is estimated that nearly 25 percent of all homes completed were financed with GI loans. About 17,000 builders are engaged in the construction of homes which are sold to veterans with the assistance of GI loans. Since the beginning of the program it is estimated that about \$17 billion was paid by veterans in connection with the purchase of new residences. In turn, this sum can be translated into proportionate amounts paid to construction workers, to the producers and sellers of building materials, and then returned to the economic stream. When viewed in this light it will be seen that in producing \$17 billion worth of veterans' homes a large lift is given to a broad segment of our national economy.

Since the current law will not expire until July 25, 1957, the question naturally occurs of why we should consider an extension in this session. I alluded earlier to the estimated number of World War II veterans who were likely to use their benefit before the present law expires. Whether this figure is 1 million or 3 million there are bound to be undesirable consequences, and the larger the number the more magnified will be the problem. I have reference to the natural rush which will occur to get in under the wire. It very well could result in considerable panic buying, and the competition which will occur in the bidding for the existing housing supply may have dire results. There truly could develop a boom-and-bust propo-

sition, with greatly accelerated activity during the next 2½ years followed by a sharp breakdown in the latter part of 1957. I fear that this would have a much too disruptive effect, and, in fact, might be a disservice rather than a benefit to the veterans involved.

Furthermore, the financing plans of investors and the planning of projects by builders ordinarily are projected over a considerable period of time. It therefore becomes necessary for both the lenders and builders to know what lies ahead in the field of Government-aided financing so that they may take it into account in determining future outlook. This is much too important a program, both to the veterans and to the industry groups, to leave the Government's role in the field of uncertainty. The Government's position must be clarified promptly in order to avoid any possibility of allowing a slowdown to occur which will result in consequences that it will take many months to repair.

I am proud to be identified as the sponsor of this bill which will do so much by way of assisting a great many veterans and which as an agreeable by-product will furnish a substantial bolstering ingredient to our economy. I urge that this bill be favorably considered in this session of Congress.

STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAM WITH LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES—EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FOREIGN TRAVEL FROM TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] I introduce for appropriate reference two bills. I ask unanimous consent that the explanatory statements on the bills, prepared by the junior Senator from Florida, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. SMATHERS) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:
S. 338. A bill to establish an effective student exchange program with Latin American countries, and for other purposes.

The statement by Senator SMATHERS, presented by Mr. CLEMENTS, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

The proposed bill would provide for a more extensive student exchange program on a reciprocal basis with Latin American countries. It would authorize the Secretary of State to conduct this program on a graduate student and an undergraduate student basis where the undergraduate student has completed at least 2 years of education above the secondary level.

The proposed legislation would also authorize the Secretary of State to provide for interchanges between the United States and Latin American countries of books, periodicals and publications and for the preparation, distribution, and interchange of other educational materials.

To assist the Secretary of State in the conduct of a broader student exchange program, my bill contains a provision which sets up a Latin American Scholarship Board consisting of 10 members to be appointed by the President. This Board would make a selection of American students accepted for study in various Latin American countries, as well as to make recommendations to the Secretary of State concerning the operation and administration of the exchange program.

The proposed legislation would also authorize the Secretary of State to cooperate with the heads of the various Departments and agencies of the Government for the purpose of utilizing the services and facilities of such Departments and agencies whenever practicable in connection with carrying out the program. In line with this provision he is also authorized to consult the Secretary of Commerce and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board with a view toward utilizing surface and air transportation facilities which are recipients of subsidies from the United States in connection with the transportation of students.

There is much need for this proposed legislation for the reason that the present student-exchange program now in operation is limited only to graduate students and professional leaders and is wholly inadequate. For example, in the fiscal year of 1954 there were only 73 students from Latin America in the United States. For the fiscal year of 1955 this number was increased to 132. These figures amply demonstrate the meager Latin-American student-exchange program now in effect and the extreme necessity that Congress take prompt action to correct the situation to promote better hemispheric mutual understanding since we all recognize that Latin America is of vital importance to us and we of equal importance to that area.

To carry out the purposes of this bill, there is a provision which would authorize an appropriation of \$5 million for the first fiscal year after its enactment and such sums as may be deemed necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

Latin America today is beset with gigantic economic problems which must be met and solved if this hemisphere is to remain secure. We must help solve their problems or else be prepared to suffer the consequences. The proposed student-exchange program is one way in which we can make a very substantial contribution in this respect for there is no doubt in my mind that it will pay off in years and in generations to come by developing closer ties of friendship and culture, as well as resulting in mutual economic advantages to each other. It is the soundest long-term investment that the United States can conceivably make, and at the same time demonstrate by positive action that we are sincerely interested in giving more than lip-service to the term "good neighbor." In addition, the adoption by the Congress of this broader student-exchange program would give renewed faith in the ultimate triumph of democracy in this hemisphere and the world.

I sincerely hope that prompt and effective action on this legislation will be taken in this session of the Congress.

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 339. A bill to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons.

The statement by Senator SMATHERS, presented by Mr. CLEMENTS, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

In introducing the proposed legislation at this time, it is my hope that adequate opportunity will be had by the committee to report it out favorably in time to permit action to be taken on it when the next tax legislation is referred by the House to the Senate for consideration.

Briefly stated, the purpose of my bill is to remove the unjust and discriminatory provisions of existing law against travel to the Caribbean, Central America, Mexico, and Canada, since these are the only areas of foreign travel subject to tax. The bill would simply treat all foreign travel equally.

The original transportation-tax law, enacted in 1941, was adopted as a wartime measure to discourage civilian travel at a time when the railroads, airlines and other forms of public transportation were vitally needed for troop movements and other essential travel.

In 1947, the law was amended by exempting from its provisions the tax on all foreign travel except travel within the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere which was defined as an area lying west of the 30th meridian west of Greenwich, east of the international dateline and north of the Equator, but not including any country of South America. Its objective was to encourage travel to Europe and South America in order to bring United States dollars to those countries for the purpose of offsetting unfavorable balances of trade as well as to assist Europe to recover from the ravages of World War II. (At that time the tax was at the rate of 15 percent. It was subsequently reduced to 10 percent by the passage of the Excise Tax Act of 1954.) While the amendment in my opinion produced the beneficial results sought to be accomplished, it created an inequitable situation by making the tax on foreign travel only applicable to travel to the Caribbean, Central America, Mexico, and Canada. It is in this respect that the present law is discriminatory against our nearby Latin American neighbors to the south, as well as to Canada, our good neighbor to the north. That these countries should be singled out in this manner is manifestly unjust particularly in view of the fact that we are vitally interested in further developing a sound and effective good-neighbor policy. I might point out here that both Canada and Mexico have long since repealed their travel tax embracing practically the same area to which our tax is now for the most part applicable.

Tourism and transit trade are important segments in the economies of our Latin American neighbors for it is in these activities that United States dollars are obtained which aid in offsetting unfavorable balances of trade that presently exist. The Caribbean area, for example, imports heavily and represents a large nearby market for our exports. The repeal of the transportation tax would undoubtedly increase the flow of American dollars to this area and the purchasing power thus provided would result in a net benefit to our own national economy.

Latin America today is beset, among other things, with economic difficulties and in view of our dependency upon each other we must assist this area in the solution of its problems or suffer from the consequences. We can take a step in the right direction by repealing the discriminatory transportation tax which represents a chief impediment toward the flow of dollars to these areas.

My bill simply provides that only the domestic portion of international travel purchased in the United States is taxable, thus removing the discriminatory provisions of existing law and putting all international travel on the same basis. In other words, that part of the trip from the point of origin in the United States to the last point in the United States at which the carrier makes a stop enroute to their foreign destination is subject to the tax. If the carrier makes no intermediate stop in the United States, no tax would apply. No other change is made in existing law. The proposed legislation retains the exemption now provided for steamship travel when the vessel does not make full traffic stops in the United States.

In the last Congress I introduced similar legislation but unfortunately it was not acted upon, despite the fact that favorable views were given by the interested executive departments of the Government. In submitting its views on that legislation the Department of State in a letter dated July 20, 1954, addressed to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, stated as follows:

"Reference is made to your letter of April 5, 1954, requesting the comments of the Department of State on S. 1353, 'To amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from tax the transportation of persons to and from Mexico, to and from Central America, and to and from the West Indies,' and the Department's acknowledgment of April 6, 1954.

"The Department favors repeal of the tax on travel to the countries affected, on the grounds that it discriminates between them and other foreign countries and thereby tends to reduce the potential volume of tourist movement to the areas covered by the tax.

"Because of the discriminatory nature of this tax, it continues to be a source of irritation in our foreign relations with the countries in the area. The tourist trade is a major economic activity there, and a principal source of dollar income in some of these countries, and such revenue is necessary to help meet their balance of payments. Assisting these countries to improve their economic position is one of the major items in the United States economic foreign policy.

"At the 16th meeting of the Caribbean Commission, held in Surinam in May 1953, a resolution was adopted as follows:

"The Commission, having regard to the earnest desire of the peoples of the countries served by it to stimulate the inflow of visitors from the North American Continent into the Caribbean area and the fact that the 15-percent excise tax on travel does not apply to all countries in the surrounding area, with the result that the tax has a discriminatory effect upon the countries served by the Commission, strongly urges that each national section take steps, through diplomatic channels, to make representations requesting the United States Government to give immediate consideration to abolishing the tax on travel to this area."

"The Department has received notes from the embassies of all of the countries affected by the tax expressing the hope of their governments that the United States would amend its revenue laws to eliminate the 15-percent tax on transportation to their countries which is working to their economic detriment by impeding the flow of tourist dollars.

"The Department respectfully suggests that your committee give careful consideration to the passage of this legislation amending the Internal Revenue Code, which affects adversely and in a very direct manner the economic well-being of friendly neighboring countries.

"The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report to your committee, and that it concurs in recommending enactment of this legislation.

"Sincerely yours,

"THURSTON B. MORTON,

"Assistant Secretary

"(For the Secretary of State)."

Similarly the Department of Commerce in a letter dated July 22, 1954, addressed to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee stated as follows:

"This letter is in reply to your request of April 5, 1954, for the views of this Department with respect to S. 1353, a bill to amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from tax the transportation of persons to and from Mexico, to and from

Central America, and to and from the West Indies.

"In 1948 the 15-percent tax in effect on all foreign travel by United States citizens since 1945 was repealed, except for travel to and from the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere. By act of Congress, April 1, 1954, this tax was reduced to 10 percent. Thus the existing discrimination against travel to the Caribbean and Central America remains in effect, although modified, while travel to other Latin American destinations and Europe is untaxed.

"Section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code was adopted as a wartime measure to discourage travel. Not only has this necessity passed, but President Eisenhower in his economic-policy message to the Congress on March 30, 1954, pointed out the importance of an increased flow of United States travel to the national economy, and international trade. Repeal of the tax as envisaged by S. 1353 would stimulate travel to an area which relies in large part upon tourist income for its dollar revenue.

"Since the Caribbean in particular imports heavily, it presents a large nearby market for American exports. An increased flow of American dollars spent by American tourists would increase the area's ability to pay for American goods with resulting net benefits to our national economy.

"The Department accordingly recommends enactment of S. 1353.

"We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that they would interpose no objection to the submission of this letter to your committee and, further, that they concur in recommending enactment of the legislation.

"Sincerely yours,

"SINCLAIR WEEKS,

"Secretary of Commerce."

It is apparent, therefore, that the purpose of this legislation has the full support, not only of the countries affected, but also of the President and the interested executive departments of the Government.

The attitude of our Government was well expressed in the official instructions issued to the United States delegation which attended the Pan American Economic Conference recently held in Rio de Janeiro. The instructions stressed the necessity of promoting international travel in tourism to these areas, and pointed out that such development necessitated the elimination of the travel tax since it is considered to be one of the chief impediments to travel in these areas. Our Latin American neighbors have bitterly and justly criticized the tax as discriminatory, and have advocated its repeal as one of the means which should be employed to assist them in establishing a sound economy to our mutual advantage.

At the recent Inter-American Economic Conference, held in Rio de Janeiro, which I attended as a delegate, our Latin American friends pointed out very strongly their opposition to this extremely unfair tax and its effect upon their economies. At that conference the United States delegation strongly endorsed the principle of increasing the trade among the Americas and the removal of various restrictions on travel and commerce. In addition we indicated to our Latin American friends that we would do everything possible to consider the repeal of this tax.

Removal of this tax will contribute greatly towards strengthening the economies of our Latin American neighbors by increasing the flow of tourist dollars to these areas. In so doing, we will make a substantial contribution toward better hemispheric defense, and at the same time strike a devastating blow against the international Communist conspiracy.

There has been no testimony in connection with similar legislation introduced by

me in the past session of the Congress from any governmental agency, private individual or geographical area that the imposition of the present transportation tax to these areas is good, fair, or beneficial. Attempts to justify it are based solely on the argument that it produces some revenue. However, the amendment which I propose would have an insignificant effect on the total proceeds of the transportation tax, for it is estimated that the loss in tax would be approximately \$10 million which is indeed a very small sum in comparison to the beneficial effects which its repeal would have in cementing better relationships with our Latin American neighbors as well as our good neighbor to the north, Canada.

In addition it seems obvious to me that by increasing travel to these areas, tax revenues from the domestic portion of this travel would be increased sufficiently to equal or exceed the estimated revenue loss.

I am sure that the Members of the Senate recognize that there is much that needs to be done to help Latin America and while my bill does not provide an entire solution to the many problems we must face, it is very definitely a step in the right direction.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I am going to recommend that the bill be given early consideration, as well as to urge my colleagues to give their support to the bill in committee, and on the floor of the Senate, for in so doing they will actively demonstrate to our Latin American friends that the words "good neighbor" are more than just mere platitudes.

UNITY OF IRELAND

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. MANSFIELD) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the House of Representatives, 65th Congress (1919), 3d session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland; and

Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless a clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

TESTIMONY OF FORMER RUSSIAN CODE CLERK RELATING TO THE INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 5)

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on January 4, 1954, representatives of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary journeyed to Canada to question Igor Gouzenko, former code clerk in the Soviet Embassy at Ottawa, under a cooperative agreement worked out between the Canadian Department of External Affairs and the United States Department of State.

A transcript of the testimony of Mr. Gouzenko subsequently was released

by the Canadian Government, pursuant to the request of the Internal Security Subcommittee, transmitted through the Department of State.

Unfortunately, this transcript was made available only in mimeographed form, and only a very few copies, relatively speaking, were distributed. The Internal Security Subcommittee has received requests for copies of this testimony, but has been unable to supply them. We are informed that Canadian officials have no copies available for distribution.

Because this questioning of Igor Gouzenko was in a very real sense a part of the activities of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, and the transcript of testimony should be formally and permanently recorded, I propose to ask that this testimony may be printed as a Senate document.

Before I make that request formally, let me say that the Gouzenko testimony is both valuable and informative. While a substantial part of Gouzenko's story already had been told, the questioning by members and counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee did bring out some facts not previously known, and the testimony did furnish some leads which were useful to the committee. Furthermore, in view of the public statements Mr. Gouzenko had made that he had information of value which he desired to give to the Internal Security Subcommittee, that committee would have been remiss in its duty if it had not sought and taken advantage of the earliest opportunity to question Mr. Gouzenko.

In view of the entire situation as outlined, this testimony by Mr. Gouzenko should be preserved as an official paper of the United States Senate; and I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the transcript of the testimony of Igor Gouzenko, given on January 4, 1954, under questioning by members and the counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate, may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sunday nominations have been received from the President and have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Without objection, the nominations will be printed in the RECORD; and pursuant to a rule adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations in the 83d Congress, the nominations will be considered by the committee at the expiration of 6 days.

(For nominations referred to, see end of Senate proceedings of today.)

BETTER USE OF SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER — THE FORTHCOMING CHICAGO CONFERENCE AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief statement prepared by me, with attachments, on the subject of accelerating United States scientific progress in both civilian and military fields.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement and the attachments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I have long been deeply interested in the effective utilization of the Nation's scientific manpower.

I regard this as a twofold necessity: (a) for the very survival of our Nation in this atomic-hydrogen-jet age; (b) for the prosperity of our expanding economy.

It is clear from great many evidences that the gap of superiority between American science and technology over that of the U. S. R. is being increasingly narrowed. Why? Because of the all-out Soviet effort to broaden Russia's industrial-military-scientific base.

SENATOR WILEY'S PREVIOUS COMMENTS

I commented on this phase in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 16, 1954, on page A6844 when I reproduced a grim analysis of Soviet engineering progress by M. H. Trytten, Director of the Office of Scientific Personnel of the National Research Council.

I also commented on November 10 on page 15913 with regard to the important work of the National Inventors Council of the United States Department of Commerce.

Earlier, on August 6, in the RECORD on pages 13505 and 13506, I had cited the need for improved military utilization of our scientists. In my judgment, it is folly to concentrate exclusively on training our manpower on today's weapons, when some of the most skilled young and older brains could be at work preparing tomorrow's weapon systems.

CHICAGO SYMPOSIUM, FEBRUARY 10 AND 11

I am pleased, therefore, that on February 10, there is being held a symposium by the Society of American Military Engineers, and cosponsored by a great many other fine public and private groups. At this meeting, there will be considered more effective military utilization of the Nation's scientific resources.

I have in my hand the text of the announcement, listing the numerous scientific, business, and military leaders who will participate in the important conference.

I congratulate these men on their forthcoming patriotic contributions to this important discussion.

While, unfortunately, it now appears that it will not be possible for me personally to be on hand, I want to say that I regard this conference as one of the most significant such gatherings which has been held in the post-war era.

The subject matter affects American education; it affects selective service and reserve policy; it affects American business and labor and agriculture.

The United States has around 300,000 scientists and 500,000 engineers. Our engineer shortage alone is around 90,000. Every major newspaper in the United States, particularly on Sundays, is full of advertisements urgently soliciting engineers to apply to fill critical job vacancies, particularly in defense plants.

I AM INTERESTED FROM TWO STANDPOINTS

Now, I want to say that wholly aside from our military effort, as crucial as that is, it is essential that America greatly increase her research effort in both pure and applied research in order to serve the expanding needs of our Nation.

I am especially interested in this subject, from the standpoint of both the committees on which I am privileged to serve. Thus, from my position on the Foreign Relations Committee, I have always sought to emphasize the need for greater scientific cooperation—civilian and military—between the Allied Nations.

I am convinced that we have not begun adequately to tap either the scientific genius of our own citizens, nor that of the great western bloc of nations. According to information compiled at my direction by counsel for our committee, this lag in interrelated scientific coordination is a particularly important problem in our western defense-economic effort.

Secondly, it is my privilege to serve as the chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trade-Mark, and Copyright Law. From that position, I have sought to encourage inventions as such, as a part of our overall technological progress.

LETTER FROM NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

In performing my role, I have been in constant touch with numerous heads of agencies of our Government, including Dr. Arthur Flemming, of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Along a similar line, I have also been in contact with the distinguished Director of the National Science Foundation, Dr. Alan T. Waterman.

Dr. Waterman promptly and thoroughly responded to a recent inquiry as to the past, present, and future work of his distinguished Foundation.

He reported, among other things, I am pleased to say, that my own State of Wisconsin has contributed significantly to the Foundation's work. Thus, 32 research grants have been awarded to educational institutions or organizations within my State.

I append the text of the announcement of the Chicago symposium, along with the text of the reply by Dr. Waterman to my most recent inquiry.

MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

(Thursday and Friday, February 10 and 11, 1955, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill.)

SPONSORS

The Society of American Military Engineers.

Industry

The National Industrial Conference Board.
Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

National Association of Manufacturers.
The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc.
Illinois Manufacturers Association.
Illinois State Chamber of Commerce.
Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

Government

United States Department of Defense.
Corps of Engineers, United States Army.
Bureau of Yards and Docks, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy.
United States Air Force (Installations).
Industrial College of the Armed Forces.
United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.
Arctic Institute of North America.
United States Department of Labor.

Professional societies

Scientific Manpower Commission.
Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council.

Constituent Societies of Engineers Joint Council

American Society of Civil Engineers.
The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.
American Institute of Electrical Engineers.
American Society for Engineering Education.
The Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.
American Institute of Chemical Engineers.
American Waterworks Association.
National Science Teachers Association.
Western Society of Engineers.
Armed Forces Chemical Association, Midwest chapter.
Engineers Society of Milwaukee.

WHY THIS CONFERENCE

The number of engineers and scientists graduating from our technical schools is considerably less than that needed to meet the demand. American industry, school faculties and the Armed Forces are increasingly feeling the shortage of technically trained manpower which could well be the deciding factor in another national emergency. Well qualified committees and commissions are studying this entire situation, and their reports are receiving more and more attention from news media.

With the expiration of the Selective Service law in June 1955, another bill dealing with military manpower will be introduced in the Congress. This bill will have far-reaching effects on the future welfare of this country. Certainly, it will require exhaustive reconsideration of our entire manpower policy by the Congress.

The Society of American Military Engineers with the cooperation of those in the technical branches of the Armed Forces, American industry, technical education, and engineering and scientific societies will bring together high ranking representation from all of these groups and organizations at this conference in Chicago on February 10-11, 1955.

This conference has received the attention of a number of experienced educators and military and industrial men. It is their united opinion that people occupying positions of responsibility in our legislative, military, educational, and industrial life could well come together to direct their thinking to the utilization of our especially trained manpower and skilled craftsmen in ways which will best serve the Nation.

OBJECTIVES

There is great public interest in our comparative world position in technological matters, as well as in all matters concerning military service. This interest, plus the varied viewpoints and responsible positions of those in attendance at this conference, should result in the conference serving as an unusual source of reliable public information. In addition, specific recommendations coming from this conference should receive most careful consideration of all those concerned with any phase of manpower utilization.

LENOX R. LOHR,
President.

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

Thursday, February 10

8:30-10:30 a. m.: Registration, mezzanine floor.

10:30-12 noon: Opening session, grand ballroom.

General chairman: Lenox R. Lohr, president, the Society of American Military Engineers and president, Museum of Science and Industry.

Invocation: Rt. Rev. Monsignor George J. Casey, Vicar General, Archdiocese of Chicago.

Chairman: Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, vice president, Remington Rand, Inc.

Speaker: L. J. Fletcher, vice president, Caterpillar Tractor Co., What It Takes To Get Production (a visual presentation of the specific contributions made by technical people in typical mass production industries).

12 noon: Luncheon.

Chairman: Gen. Lucius D. Clay, United States Army (retired) chairman of the board, Continental Can Co., Inc.

Speaker: Dr. M. H. Trytten, Director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council—"Our Technical Manpower Situation Today."

2 p. m.: Afternoon session. The development and Utilization of Our Technical Manpower.

Chairman: Rear Adm. John R. Perry, CEC, United States Navy, Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Speakers: Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), The Needs of Industry.

Dr. John T. Rettaliata, president, Illinois Institute of Technology, Technical Education and Technical Societies.

Brig. Gen. Carlton Dargusch, Military Service Legislation.

Discussion: Dr. Walter H. Zinn, director, Argonne National Laboratory; Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, United States Army, Director of Selective Service; Thomas R. Reid, chairman, subcommittee on manpower, national defense committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and director, office of civic affairs, Ford Motor Co.; Dean D. H. Loughridge, Technological Institute, Northwestern University.

Friday, February 11

9:30 a. m.-12 noon: Panel symposium.

NOTE.—The entire time of this session will be devoted to the various panel members replying to questions on the general subject of the conference. These questions will be those submitted in advance or during the conference.

Chairman and moderator: Ralph L. Goetzenberger, vice president, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.

Panel members: Dr. John T. Rettaliata, president, Illinois Institute of Technology; Carter Lane Burgess, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel; United States Senator Alexander Wiley (tentative); Dr. M. H. Trytten, director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council; Leo R. Werts, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Manpower, United States Department of Labor; Dr. Blake R. Van Leer, president, Georgia Institute of Technology; Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana); Dr. J. Roscoe Miller, president, Northwestern University; Dean A. A. Potter, Purdue University; M. H. Isenberg, president, Combustion Engineering, Inc.; Maj. Gen. Lee B. Washbourne, United States Air Force, Assistant Chief of Staff, Installations; L. J. Fletcher, vice president, Caterpillar Tractor Co.; M. M. Boring, engineering manpower consultant, General Electric Co.; Dr. Thomas H. Chilton, technical director, development engineering division, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; Edwin L. Yates, central office personnel activities, General Motors Corp.; Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, Executive Director, Scientific Manpower Commission; W. T. Cavanaugh, executive secretary, Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council; Dean W. L. Everitt, chairman, administrative division, American Society for Engineering Education; Thomas R. Reid, chairman, subcommittee on manpower, national defense committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and director, office of civic affairs, Ford Motor Co.; Dr. Edmond Claxton, director of research, Armstrong Cork Co., and chairman, subcommittee on manpower and research, National Association of Manufacturers.

(Panel discussions will continue from 2 p. m. to 4:30 p. m.)
12 noon: Luncheon.

Chairman: United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (tentative).

Speaker: Victor E. Cooley, Deputy Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Defense Mobilization Program—With Emphasis on Manpower Aspects.

Panel consultants: M. T. Carpenter, president, Scientific Manpower Commission; Dr. Joseph O. Hirschfelder, University of Wisconsin; Hon. Dewey Short, House of Representatives, Armed Services Committee; Hon. Overton Brooks, House of Representatives, Armed Services Committee; H. H. Armsby, Chief for Engineering Education, Department of Health, Engineering, and Welfare, United States Office of Education; Theron H. Rice, secretary, national defense committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Rear Adm. R. F. A. Studts, Director, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Representatives of the American Legion: Seaborn P. Collins, national commander; Bruce P. Henderson, chairman, national security council; James P. Ringley.

COMMITTEES

General chairman: Lenox R. Lohr, president, the Society of American Military Engineers and president, Museum of Science and Industry.

Program committee

Chairman: L. J. Fletcher, vice president, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

Dr. Thomas H. Chilton, technical director, Development Engineering Division, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Gail A. Hathaway, Engineering Manpower Commission.

W. T. Cavanaugh, executive secretary, Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council.

Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, executive director, Scientific Manpower Commission.

Dr. M. H. Trytten, director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council.

M. T. Carpenter, president, Scientific Manpower Commission.

Ralph L. Goetzenberger, vice president, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regular Co.

Maj. Gen. Douglas L. Weart, national director, the Society of American Military Engineers.

Dan A. Sullivan, national director, the Society of American Military Engineers.

Publicity committee

Chairman: John F. O'Keefe, secretary, Chicago Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Walter J. Murphy, editor, Chemical & Engineering News.

J. Earl Harrington, executive secretary, Western Society of Engineers.

D. M. MacMaster, director, Museum of Science & Industry.

Stewart Howe, vice president in charge of Development & Public Relations, Illinois Institute of Technology.

Finance committee

Chairman: Dan A. Sullivan, national director, Society of American Military Engineers.

Maj. Gen. Douglas L. Weart, national director, Society of American Military Engineers.

Arrangements committee

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, chairman of the board, Continental Can Co., Inc.

Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana).

Willis Gale, chairman, Commonwealth Edison Co.

Lt. Gen. Hobart R. Gay, United States Army, commanding, Fifth Army.

Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray, former commanding officer, Transportation Corps, United States Army.

Rear Adm. Daniel V. Gallery, United States Navy, Commandant, Ninth Naval District.

Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

W. A. Roberts, president, Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co.

Merrill C. Meigs, vice president, the Hearst Corp.

William V. Kahler, president, Illinois Bell Telephone Co.

Lt. Gen. C. C. Haffner, Jr., chairman of the board, R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co.

James L. Donnelly, executive vice president, Illinois Manufacturers' Association.

Walker L. Cisler, president, the Detroit Edison Co.

H. A. Barber, president, Barber-Greene Co.

Dr. John T. Rettallata, president, Illinois Institute of Technology.

Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, vice president, Remington Rand, Inc.

Dr. Leverett Lyon, chairman, executive committee, Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

John S. Knight, publisher, Chicago Daily News.

H. S. Eberhard, president, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

James F. Oates, Jr., chairman, the Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co.

John L. McCaffrey, president, International Harvester Co.

Walter J. Cummings, chairman, Continental, Ill., National Bank and Trust Co.

Ross D. Siragusa, president, Admiral Corp.

Marshall Field, Jr., editor and publisher, Chicago Sun-Times.

Rear Adm. John R. Perry, CEC, United States Navy, Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

J. Lewis Powell, Office, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply and Logistics.

Lt. Gen. W. B. Kean, executive director, Chicago Housing Authority.

Carlton S. Proctor, Moran, Proctor, Mueser & Rutledge.

Charles W. Bryan, Jr., president, Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co.

Dr. Louis C. McCabe, Chief, Fuels and Explosives Division, Bureau of Mines, United States Department of the Interior.

Maj. Gen. Douglas L. Weart, national director, the Society of American Military Engineers.

Walter J. Murphy, editor, Chemical and Engineering News.

Col. Henry Crown, Chairman, Material Service Corporation.

Maj. Gen. Lee B. Washbourne, Assistant Chief of Staff, Installations, United States Air Force.

Gail A. Hathaway, Engineering Manpower Commission.

Thomas H. Coulter, chief executive officer, Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

Brig. Gen. L. H. Whiting, president, American Furniture Mart.

A. M. Thompson, chairman, Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co.

A. T. Etcheson, executive vice president, Illinois Bankers Association.

Dr. Gustav Egloff, director of research, Universal Oil Products Co.

F. M. Rich, general superintendent, Indiana Harbor Works, Inland Steel Co.

E. J. Albrecht, E. J. Albrecht Co.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1955.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It was very heartening, indeed, to receive your letter of December 27, 1954, which showed such understanding of the problems confronting us in the National Science Foundation. It is now commonly accepted that our national security and welfare depend in no small degree upon the strengthening of our scientific effort.

The problem is primarily one of finding ways and means to insure a satisfactory level of basic scientific research and to have sufficient fully trained, highly qualified, scientists in the country. As Dr. James B. Conant stated in the first annual report of the Foundation: "In the advance of science and its application to many practical problems, there is no substitute for first-class men. Ten second-rate scientists or engineers cannot do the work of one who is in the first rank." The administration's present concern with this problem is shown by the fact that a special Interdepartmental Committee on the Training of Scientists and Engineers, of which I was a member, has considered the problem and recently made a report to the President.

The National Science Foundation has been attacking this problem on several fronts.

First of all, we have a program of grants for support of basic research, almost entirely in the universities. Besides supporting valuable basic research, this grants program provides opportunities to potential young scientists to participate as assistants to established researchers and thus increase their competence. We are recommending a substantial increase in this program for fiscal 1956.

Second, the Foundation since its inception has had a program of graduate fellowships which assists selected science students in continuing their training in science. These fellowships to date have been awarded for the most part to students who have achieved their bachelor's degree and are working toward their doctor's degree. As an indication of the demand for these predoctoral fellowships, we received last year applications from 2,865 students, 657 of whom were awarded fellowships. An additional 1,359 received honorable mention as being of fellowship caliber.

We believe that a Federal fellowship program, particularly at the predoctoral level, should be used primarily to stimulate interest and to assist the truly outstanding student. Therefore, while we are recommending to the Congress this year a small increase for predoctoral fellowships, we are recommending a relatively more substantial increase for our program of postdoctoral fellowships, and are also proposing that a special postdoctoral fellowship program be instituted for senior scientists.

Third, since the problem of increasing the quality and number of scientists must be attacked across a broad front, we have initiated a program called "education in the sciences." This program recognizes that a widening gap between the demand for and supply of teachers of science in the years ahead is possibly the greatest obstacle to the training of adequate numbers of high-caliber scientists. If we are to meet the requirements of an ever-expanding economy and the military demands created by international tension, we must make certain that our high schools and colleges are adequately staffed with well qualified and stimulating science teachers. To cope with these problems the Foundation has under way a 3-point program relating to help for teachers, improvement of the science curriculum and motivation of students. We are recommending a substantial expansion in this program for the 1956 fiscal year.

However, the problems are intricate and are not susceptible of easy solution. We believe that many more facts need to be known and analyzed before wise decisions as to Federal policies to achieve the desired results can be made. To this end, the foundation now has a comprehensive program of studies underway. These studies include:

(a) Comprehensive survey of the present and future supply and use of scientific and technical manpower in the United States, with special reference to Government, industry and educational institutions.

(b) A technical study of methods of measuring demand-supply relationships with respect to scientific manpower.

(c) Studies of doctor of philosophy degrees granted in science and a study of various methods of increasing the competence and effectiveness of our teachers of science.

(d) A study of factors influencing our most talented high-school graduates in deciding whether or not to continue formal education.

(e) Study of feasibility and desirability of scholarship aid to college students.

These studies will be extended in the future. The information assembled will be helpful in determining the effectiveness of present Federal policies and in isolating particular problem areas to which new solutions must be found. Among the major problems which must be examined will be those relating to the need for undergraduate scholarship aid and for assistance to States and educational institutions in support of the teaching of science. As conclusions are arrived at, we will make appropriate recommendations.

We feel, therefore, that the budget proposed to the Congress for the foundation for fiscal 1956 represents an appropriate step forward. In reply to your kind offer of cooperation we must state that while it would be possible administratively to enlarge any of our programs beyond the amounts recommended to Congress, we are not prepared to recommend such action at this time. If Congress approves our budget as submitted, we will be able to expand our programs somewhat and to conduct the studies necessary to determine whether more ambitious Federal programs should be undertaken in the future.

You will be interested to know, I believe, that to date 32 research grants totaling \$421,920 have been awarded to educational institutions or organizations within the State of Wisconsin. In addition, the foundation has awarded six grants to scientists in the State of Wisconsin to assist them in travel to international scientific meetings. Since the foundation fellowship program was established, there have been 54 recipients of fellowships who were residents of Wisconsin. In addition, 56 have received honorable mention in fellowship competition. It may be of particular interest to you to know that 86 recipients of foundation fellowships have elected to pursue their studies at the University of Wisconsin. Finally, in addition to Dr. Edwin B. Fred, who is a member of the National Science Board, there are 14 residents of the State of Wisconsin who are serving or have served on the foundation's science advisory panels.

I have tried to give you our general approach and plans in reply to your kind letter. We will take the liberty, if we may, of keeping you advised as to our progress and plans from time to time. If you would care to go into the matter further, I should of course be pleased to visit you at your convenience. I particularly appreciate your interest and will welcome your views at any time.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "Future of American Foreign Policy," delivered by him at Philadelphia, Pa., on January 10, 1955.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Statement containing biographical sketch and description of career of Dr. Abraham Shaoni, grand master of Masons of the State of Israel.

MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If there is no further routine business to be transacted, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk the recommendations of the majority for the consideration of the Senate with reference to the respective chairmen and the majority membership of the standing committees of the Senate. I understand that the distinguished minority leader is prepared to submit recommendations from the minority conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, by direction of the Republican conference, I submit a list of Republican appointments to the standing committees of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the respective lists of the majority and minority conferences.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On Agriculture and Forestry: Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, chairman; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; John J. Williams, of Delaware; and Andrew F. Schoepel, of Kansas.

On Appropriations: Carl Hayden, of Arizona, chairman; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico; Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Lister Hill, of Alabama; Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; John Stennis, of Mississippi; Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota; William F. Knowland, of California; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; and Charles E. Potter, of Michigan.

On Armed Services: Richard B. Russell, of Georgia, chairman; Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; John Stennis, of Mississippi; Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Samuel J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Francis Case, of South Dakota; James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania; and Herman Welker, of Idaho.

On Banking and Currency: J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas, chairman; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; John Sparkman, of Alabama; J. Allen Frear, of Delaware; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Herbert H. Lehman, of New York; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Irving M. Ives, of New York; Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah; Prescott Bush, of Connecticut; J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; Frederick G. Payne, of Maine; and Wayne Morse, of Oregon.

On District of Columbia: Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia, chairman; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Pat McNamara, of Michigan; J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; Roman L. Hruska, of Nebraska; Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey; Gordon Allott, of Colorado; and Wayne Morse, of Oregon.

On Finance: Harry Floyd Byrd, of Virginia, chairman; Walter F. George, of Georgia; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; J. Allen Frear, of Delaware; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; George A. Smathers, of Florida; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Aiben W. Barkley, of Kentucky; Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; John J. Williams, of Delaware; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; George W. Malone, of Nevada; Frank Carlson, of Kansas; and Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah.

On Foreign Relations: Walter F. George, of Georgia, chairman; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas; John Sparkman, of Alabama; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Aiben W. Barkley, of Kentucky; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; William Langer, of North Dakota; William F. Knowland, of California; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; and Wayne Morse, of Oregon.

On Government Operations: John L. McClellan, of Arkansas, chairman; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts; Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Samuel J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire; George H. Bender, of Ohio; and Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa.

On Interior and Insular Affairs: James E. Murray, of Montana, chairman; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon; Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; George W. Malone, of Nevada; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; Thomas H. Kuchel, of California; Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming; and Barry Goldwater, of Arizona.

On Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, chairman; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; George A. Smathers, of Florida; Price Daniel, of Texas; Samuel J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Andrew F. Schoepel, of Kansas; John Marshall Butler, of Maryland; Charles E. Potter, of Michigan; James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania; William A. Purtell, of Connecticut; and Frederick G. Payne, of Maine.

On the Judiciary: Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, chairman; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Price Daniel, of Texas; Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; William Langer, of

North Dakota; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; Herman Welker, of Idaho; and John Marshall Butler, of Maryland.

On Labor and Public Welfare: Lister Hill, of Alabama, chairman; James E. Murray, of Montana; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Herbert H. Lehman, of New York; John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts; Pat McNamara, of Michigan; H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Irving M. Ives, of New York; William A. Purtell, of Connecticut; Barry Goldwater, of Arizona; George H. Bender, of Ohio; and Gordon Allott, of Colorado.

On Post Office and Civil Service: Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, chairman; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri; W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina; Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon; Frank Carlson, of Kansas; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; William Langer, of North Dakota; Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska; Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa; and Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey.

On Public Works: Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, chairman; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; Pat McNamara, of Michigan; Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; Francis Case, of South Dakota; Prescott Bush, of Connecticut; Thomas H. Kuchel, of California; Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire; and Roman L. Hruska, of Nebraska.

On Rules and Administration: Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, chairman; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Mike Mansfield, of Montana; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; and Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the membership lists be adopted.

The motion was agreed to.

FARM PRICE SUPPORT LEGISLATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as the 84th Congress begins its legislative work, I should like to speak for a few moments on a controversial matter which was the subject of great debate during the 83d Congress; and which, from all indications, is likely to become again the subject of congressional inquiry, although I hope not legislation. I refer to the field of farm price support legislation.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, in an address before the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives Convention at Chicago, Ill., made a statement, with respect to the flexible price support features of the Agricultural Act of 1954, which merits magnification at this time. Secretary Benson rightly concluded that, since all basic commodities, except wheat, will be supported at or near 90 percent of parity in 1955, "if farm income from some of the basic crops is lower this year than last, it will not be because of flexible price supports. The reduction will come, if it comes at all, from the curtailment of acreage and production made necessary by surpluses accumulated under the earlier program." In addition, the Secretary discussed the methods and

programs being used to attack this problem of shrinking farm profits.

Since farm-price-support policy is a complex subject, I most sincerely commend this talk to the Members of the Senate for their reading, and to that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVES FACE THE FARM PRICE SQUEEZE
(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson before 26th annual meeting of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Chicago, Ill.)

This represents another homecoming for me and, as always, it is an inspiring experience to visit again with so many good friends. Among my most treasured remembrances are the years when I served as executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

It is a great pleasure to be back with you today and to have this challenging opportunity to discuss our mutual interest in developing a prosperous, stable and free agriculture. The theme of this 26th annual meeting—"Farmer Cooperatives Attack the Price-Cost Squeeze"—is an appropriate one. It ties together the immediate problem facing farmers and an effective method of meeting it.

For nearly 4 years now, farm prices have been declining. Since February of 1951, prices received by farmers have plunged 24 percent, while the prices they pay have fallen only 4 percent. These figures constitute an eloquent explanation of why farm pocket-books are being pinched.

The financial pangs which go with readjustment to a peacetime economy are not new to agriculture. We have suffered them following every war in our history. Just as farm commodity prices go up farther than the general price level under the stimulus of war and inflation, they also drop farther and faster than most nonfarm prices while the economy is readjusting to more nearly normal conditions. We are making the transition this time with fewer and less severe dislocations in agriculture and other segments of our economy than ever before.

The depression which was so freely predicted a year ago failed to materialize. From an economic point of view, 1954 proved to be the best peacetime year in history, although agriculture did not fully share in this prosperity. The changeover has hurt and is hurting most of our farm people. I would not minimize the seriousness of the situation.

Yet I believe all of the evidence indicates we have seen the worst. I am convinced that for agriculture the road ahead will be smoother than the one we have been traveling.

For several months now, most farm prices have been relatively stable. For the last 2 years, in fact, the parity ratio has averaged about 90, fluctuating narrowly between 94 and 86. It will be recalled that there was a 19-point plunge in the parity ratio during the 2 years preceding January 1953 when the new administration was installed.

We must not be content with mere stability of farm prices at current levels, however. But the price decline had to be halted before it could be reversed. The first half of that objective is being attained. The job at hand now is to get farm prices back into better balance with the general price level.

While we are doing this, we must never lose sight of the fact that price alone does not insure farm prosperity. It is price times volume that makes gross income. The story does not end even there. It's what remains in a farmer's pocket after the bills are paid—

his net income—that measures whether he has had a good year or a bad one. The theme you have chosen for this meeting shows that you clearly recognize the importance of these other factors besides price.

There are four obvious fronts on which we can attack this problem of shrinking farm profits. We are moving forward on all of them.

First, Government price-support programs help farmers market many of their products in a more orderly manner, minimizing the severity of seasonal gluts and surpluses. Nonrecourse storage loans on a variety of crops provide guaranteed minimum prices to qualified farmers. Authority to set aside up to \$2½ billion worth of surplus commodities has helped to take some of the pressure off free market prices of wheat and cotton.

Second, we are expanding our markets abroad through the billion dollar Agricultural Trade Development Act which permits the sale of surplus farm products for foreign currencies and provides additional outlets through donations for relief and famine aid. We are moving increased quantities of Government-owned surpluses into channels of consumption at home through school lunch programs and gifts to needy persons, institutions, and welfare agencies. In addition to stepped-up consumption of dairy products by the Armed Forces, we are expanding our school lunch milk program by \$50 million a year.

These actions tend to reduce the supply and strengthen demand for farm products. Their cumulative effect upon agricultural prices should become even more apparent in the year ahead.

The third line of attack upon the farm cost-price squeeze is through research, education, and improved marketing. Government outlays for these programs have been increased by approximately \$20 million during the current fiscal year. The great gains of agriculture in the past have come about largely through this approach and so, I am confident, will those of the future.

Greater efficiency, broader use of the better feeds, seeds, and breeds, the adoption of improved cultural practices and employment of sound marketing methods—all taken together—will do more to help farmers meet the cost-price squeeze than any program of Government aid which could be devised by mortal man.

Fourth, farmers themselves, through their cooperative efforts, are attacking—and effectively attacking—this perplexing cost-price problem. I am certain that your discussions here will give further impetus to that drive. I mention this phase of the over-all campaign last—not because I think it is least important but because I should like to discuss it more fully at this point.

During the lifetime of most of us gathered here, the American cooperative movement has progressed from a small, struggling upstart to a vast, thriving enterprise. Cooperatives formed by a handful of men two or three decades ago have mushroomed into flourishing organizations, serving many thousands of farmer members.

Cooperatives operate in many fields today, with varying success. I believe that a major reason for their growth and their greatest opportunity to be of further service to agriculture is found in two main areas: the marketing of farm commodities and the cooperative purchasing of the fertilizers, seeds, feeds, and other products which farmers require in their operations. In carrying out these principal functions, farmer cooperatives are hitting the cost-price squeeze from two directions. Cooperative marketing can bring better prices, while cooperative buying often reduces costs.

In an age which places so much emphasis upon size and the dramatic, our sense of values may sometimes become confused.

When we buy a new automobile, it is likely to be horsepower, rather than safety features, which guides our choice. The home-run hitter, who strikes out oftener than he connects, wins the popular applause while the solid team player often goes almost unnoticed. The corporation executive who has guided his firm through a year of record-breaking profits makes the front pages while an important scientific advance may rate a line or two back near the classified ads.

It is understandable enough that we should measure the success of some of our farmer cooperatives by similar standards—by their financial statements, by their volume of business, or even by their total membership. Yet all of us know that the real test is a very simple one: Has this cooperative contributed to a better standard of living for its individual farmer members? Has it increased their income? Has it brought real benefits and services which would not have been theirs except for this cooperative?

If the answer to these questions is "Yes," then we have a farmer cooperative in the true sense of the term.

All of us who are interested in the continuing success of the cooperative movement—members and officials alike—must never lose sight of the real objective. Farmer cooperatives must not adopt abuses once practiced by some commercial enterprises—the very abuses which, in many instances, originally led to the formation of these same cooperatives.

Recently I issued a memorandum relating to the responsibilities and activities of employees of the Department. One section is of particular interest to cooperatives. It provides that no employee of the Department of Agriculture shall approve contracts with any cooperative or other commercial organization which deducts, or checks off from payments owed to farmers, membership dues in any general or specialized farm organization, except with the consent of the individual farmer.

The reason for this order is obvious. It is not the function of the Department of Agriculture to recruit farmers, directly or indirectly, as involuntary members of any organization. I am pleased to report that most cooperatives and farm organizations are apparently in agreement with this philosophy.

As we move into this new year, the Agricultural Act of 1954, with its flexible price supports for basic commodities, will get its first test. It marks a change of direction, rather than any revolutionary upheaval. Adjustments in the level of support will be gradual, in line with President Eisenhower's recommendations.

Tobacco will continue to be supported at 90 percent of parity, and it seems probable that will also be the level for peanuts and cotton in 1955. Current estimates are that corn will be supported at 88 percent of parity. Rice may be supported at about the same level as last year if marketing quotas are approved. Only in the case of wheat will price supports be at the minimum of 82½ percent.

These figures strongly indicate that if farm income from some of the basic crops is lower this year than last, it will not be because of flexible price supports. The reduction will come, if it comes at all, from the curtailment of acreage and production made necessary by surpluses accumulated under the earlier program.

In the case of such feed grains as oats, barley, grain sorghums, and rye—which have been under a system of discretionary flexible price supports for many years—the level for 1955 will be at 70 percent of parity. This represents a reduction from the 85 percent supports prevailing during the last year.

It is apparent that large acreages diverted from wheat, corn, and cotton will go into feed grains—more even than in 1954, which saw a sizeable shift in this direction. Con-

tinued supports at 85 percent of parity could only mean the Government would wind up as the owner of a considerable portion of the increased feed grain production.

At the same time, the serious and protracted drought which still grips more than 900 counties in 18 States has created severe local feed shortages. Drought-hit farmers must be given every opportunity to produce as much feed as possible when rains do come. If drought continues, lower price supports will make feed grains available to farmers at less cost than if the Government were bidding a higher price. This will encourage the movement of these grains into channels of consumption, rather than into storage.

I am convinced that our new program of flexible price supports for the basic commodities will work toward better balanced production in the years ahead. And I should like to see this balance restored primarily through an increase in consumption both here and abroad, rather than through continued strict production controls. Flexible supports will help restore the function of price in our marketing system.

We can best insure a continuation of our great progress as a Nation by maintaining a free and fluid economy. Government policy must not be permitted to freeze our agricultural production in uneconomic patterns. Neither should we freeze people in farming or in any other occupation. It is the basic freedom of the individual to shift to new pursuits with the changing times that has helped to make us the most productive country on earth.

All Americans share in the benefits which spring from a free society. The rapid advances brought about through the application of agricultural research and education and improved marketing methods have permitted millions of people to leave the land in recent decades for other productive enterprises in the cities and towns. They are making the automobiles, the radios, the television sets, and a variety of other goods which add to our better living standards. The remarkable efficiency of agriculture has made possible this important contribution to our entire economy.

Select, if you will, any Nation on the face of this globe where one-half or even one-fourth of the total labor force is producing food and fiber to meet domestic needs and you will also find a country barren of most luxury goods and even many of the things we regard as necessities. I have little sympathy for the anguished cries of those who insist that America will be ruined unless Government somehow makes farming so attractive that no rural lad will ever again venture forth to the city. As a Nation, we would never have come this far under such a philosophy. Under it, we wouldn't get where we are going, either.

Who shall say what the future limitations may be upon our national development? In agriculture, what new crops will tomorrow bring? What new uses for old crops? In a world just now entering the atomic age, some of the most exciting laboratories ever known to man may be right on our farms.

Back in 1924 American farmers harvested just under 5 million bushels of soybeans. In 1954 our soybean production was a record-breaking 343 million bushels, with a market value of nearly \$1 billion. Thus in the short space of three decades we have seen the development of a new major crop in this country and with it a new major industry.

We may be approaching the day when it won't be possible to coax that one additional egg from our top laying hens. Sometime the top-producing cow on one of our experimental farms will perhaps cock a disapproving eye at a scientist and say, "Look, this has gone far enough—you've got the last pint."

But future generations need fear no shortages of food or fiber if we succeed in bring-

ing the average output of our farms up somewhere near the productive levels of our more efficient units. This, we know, can be done.

For the year ahead the outlook is generally good for agriculture and the Nation as a whole. Business activity is at the highest peacetime level in history. In total we are consuming more food than ever before and our tastes are running more and more to the higher priced protein diet items. This trend seems likely to continue and it emphasizes that the needs of tomorrow will be for more feed and forage to provide the livestock products which our population is demanding.

As I indicated earlier, the new Trade Development Act is helping us expand our foreign markets. To date we have concluded or are in the process of negotiating sales for foreign currency involving \$453 million worth of surplus farm commodities owned by Commodity Credit Corporation. Wheat and cotton are the principal items involved, although tobacco, rice, barley, and other commodities will also be included.

There is another comparatively recent development that holds tremendous promise for agriculture. Thanks to President Eisenhower's personal and official concern and the action of the 83d Congress, the Department of Agriculture for the first time has the tools to deal effectively with the problems of small watersheds. We are now prepared to help technically and, to a limited extent, financially, in carrying out projects which the individual cannot complete on his own.

We may now bring the water element into balance with the soil element in our national soil and water program. We have new authorization for approaching soil and water problems on a watershed basis. This will accelerate and implement the soil and water program that has gained so much momentum over the past two decades. It offers new opportunities to work on problems that require community action.

No one can grow up on a southern Idaho farm, as I did, and be oblivious to the anxieties and heartaches surrounding the problems of water development and management. Still fresh in my memory are the disastrous floods that time and again wrought havoc with the canal systems and buried whole farms under sterile debris.

Nor am I unaware of the suffering and anguish which the last 4 years of continued drought have brought farmers and ranchers in the Southeast, parts of the Midwest and southern Great Plains.

These are reasons why I am firmly convinced that our water problem is welded to problems of land and people. Land and water are inseparable in planning and in use. It is the water which carries away so much of our soil. The water problem is not just one of shortages or floods affecting cities and industries. The problem has its beginning up on the farms and in the forests of our small watersheds.

In the Department of Agriculture we are determined to assist farmers to carry out a more effective program of soil and water development and wise utilization on a nationwide basis. This naturally includes protection and development of soil and water resources on individual farms and ranches and also in the small watersheds or sub-watersheds.

Everywhere farmers are interested in the efficient use of water. It is the lifeblood of the West, both for irrigated and dryland farming. And in the East, many farmers could use supplementary irrigation at some time during the growing season.

Farmer cooperatives have a vital stake in this whole problem which is tied so closely to the future welfare of agriculture. Currently there is broad interest in the new provision of the amended Water Facilities Act which authorizes direct or insured loans in all

States for soil and water conservation practices—for irrigation, drainage, pasture improvement and reforestation on farms. We may now insure such loans up to a total of \$25 million per year.

Farmers who participate in cooperative water developments may now borrow up to \$250,000 through the Farmers' Home Administration for a single joint project. The former limitation was \$100,000. Private lending agencies are matching the interest of farmers and groups of farmers in this expanded program. Private funds for FHA-insured loans for soil and water development and farm ownership are now available in an amount four times that of a year ago.

I have sought to emphasize in these remarks today several, though by no means all, of the programs which are being directed toward assuring a stable, prosperous and free agriculture. In many of them, farmers are playing the major role. Trade development, market expansion, research, education, conservation and progress through cooperative efforts are continuing, day-in-and-day-out operations. They are seldom dramatic. Consequently they do not always receive the attention they deserve, even though they are responsible for most of the great gains of agriculture.

The future of American agriculture is bright. A kind providence has blessed this Nation with vast natural resources—with soils and climate which with American ingenuity and courage have provided the basis for a standard of living unmatched in any other land. May God guide us in the wise use and conservation of these resources for the benefit of posterity and, indeed, for all mankind.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senators wish to speak, I desire to make a brief announcement concerning the business of the Senate.

At the conclusion of business today, I plan to move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next. On Friday consideration will be given to Senate Resolution 18, submitted by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and by a substantial majority of the other Members of this body. The subject of the resolution, the continuation of investigations of Communist conspiracy and subversion, was considered briefly on the floor during the recent interim session of the Senate. It may be that after the distinguished minority leader has counseled with Members on his side of the aisle, and perhaps with some of the Members on this side of the aisle, it will be desired to have the resolution referred to a committee.

However, if it be agreeable to the minority leader and the Members on his side of the aisle, and also agreeable to Members on this side of the aisle, I shall move on Friday to take the resolution from the table and ask for its consideration at that time.

I should like to place the Senate on notice that the text of the resolution has been printed in the RECORD and has been discussed on the floor of the Senate previously.

It may very well be that orderly procedure would indicate that the resolution should be referred to a committee; and if that be the feeling of any Member of the Senate, I believe that the distinguished minority leader would join

with me in moving that that course be followed. However, that procedure would not be necessary; and if all Senators were in agreement, the resolution might be considered on Friday.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 14, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James C. H. Bonbright, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal, vice M. Robert Guggenheim, resigned.

James Clement Dunn, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

John Lodge, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Belton O'Neal Bryan, of South Carolina.
J. Robert Fluker, of Kansas.
Harold G. Kissick, of Maryland.
Leonard H. Price, of Virginia.
Louis F. Thompson, of Indiana.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James S. Beddie, of Maryland.
William L. Hamilton, Jr., of Maryland.
Charles N. Manning, of Virginia.
Norman M. Pearson, of Maryland.
Charles F. Pick, Jr., of Virginia.
George M. Pollard, of Virginia.
Joseph Rosa, of Wisconsin.
Ansel N. Taylor, of Idaho.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William E. Beauchamp, Jr., of California.
Robert L. Brown, of New Jersey.
Darwin J. DeGolia, of Maryland.
Paul W. Deibel, of Ohio.
Miss Selma G. Freedman, of the District of Columbia.
John K. Havemeyer, of Illinois.
T. Greig Henderson, of the District of Columbia.
John J. Janke, of Ohio.
Miss Elizabeth Jorjick, of the District of Columbia.
Northrop H. Kirk, of California.
Duncan A. D. Mackay, of New Jersey.
John B. Penfold, of Missouri.
Richard B. Peters, of Oklahoma.
Hilding A. Peterson, of Minnesota.
James A. Ramsay, of Massachusetts.
Robert L. Redding, of Florida.
Miss Genevieve F. Rifley, of Nebraska.
Melvin E. Sinn, of Virginia.

Horace L. Talley, of Virginia.
Niemann A. Terry, Jr., of South Carolina.
John C. Thornburg, of Maryland.
Christopher Van Hollen, of the District of Columbia.

Miss A. Dorothea Wool, of Maryland.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Alma M. Armstrong, of Maine.
Howard J. Ashford, Jr., of Colorado.
James H. Ashida, of Washington.
Herbert Corkran, Jr., of Virginia.
Miss Mary G. Crain, of Maryland.
Miss Lois M. Day, of Ohio.
Miss Hazel C. Dougherty, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Eleanor Ebert, of Pennsylvania.
Arne T. Fliflet, of South Carolina.
Miss Helen F. Foose, of California.
Miss Anna G. Foster, of Texas.
Joseph R. Jacyno, of Massachusetts.
Lawrence J. Kennon, of California.
Mrs. Elvira P. Martin, of Connecticut.
Miss Anne W. Meriam, of Massachusetts.
George C. Mitchell, of Nebraska.
Miss Charlotte M. Morehouse, of Virginia.
Peter J. Raineri, of New York.
Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Miss Harriet C. Thurgood, of Florida.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Richard W. Boehm, of New York.
Richard J. Brynildsen, of California.
Miss Pamela F. Craig, of Pennsylvania.
Daniel H. Daniels, of Virginia.
John R. Davis, Jr., of California.
Donald B. Easom, of Wisconsin.
Louis P. Goetz III, of Pennsylvania.
Lewis D. Junior, of Missouri.
Richard G. Long, of Illinois.
Charles N. Rassias, of Massachusetts.
William F. Ryan, of New York.
Miss Frances A. Usenik, of Minnesota.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIRECTOR

Joseph F. Finnegan, of New York, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Charles M. Coulter, Epworth Methodist Church, Toledo, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Father of all men and God of peace, we praise Thee for the innumerable blessings, both spiritual and material, which Thou hast bestowed upon us.

We thank Thee, Father, that Thou hast sent Thy witnesses in every period of our national life; that Thou hast raised up in our legislature noble men and women of clear vision, high ideals, unfaltering courage and with devotion to freedom, truth, and justice, who have enriched our individual and national life.

Our Father, we confess before Thee with sorrow and shame that too often we have tried to live without Thee. May we as a nation humble ourselves now under Thy mighty hand.

Most gracious God, we pray for these Representatives in Congress assembled. Thou knowest the difficult problems which confront them. Endow them with understanding, a pure purpose, and sound speech. Enable them to realize

that Thou dost offer them light to guide, wisdom to understand, and strength to overcome the forces of evil.

We earnestly pray for insight to guide us in these difficult days, that we may build a society worthy of being called the Kingdom of God on earth. This we ask in the name of our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 66)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The 83d Congress made an outstanding record in progressive personnel legislation for the benefit of the Government and its employees. Among other steps forward, the new laws improved overtime pay practices, established a governmentwide incentive awards program, removed restrictive controls on appointments, authorized group life insurance, and extended the benefits of the unemployment insurance system to Federal workers. These changes have taken us a long way toward the goal of combining the best practices of private employers with the special demands of public service.

I am now recommending the enactment of legislation to improve other aspects of Federal personnel management, including adjustments in basic pay scales, group health insurance, employee training, personnel practices affecting Government employees stationed overseas, and increased travel allowances. Specific legislative proposals for carrying out these recommendations will be submitted shortly by the Civil Service Commission, the State Department, and the Bureau of the Budget. Their purpose will be to bring the average governmental remuneration into line with prevailing nongovernmental standards. I earnestly urge favorable consideration of them by the Congress.

ADJUSTMENTS OF PAY SCALES

Pay adjustments are needed (1) to recognize more fully the differences between the duties and responsibilities of positions of varying levels, (2) to relieve as far as possible, under the present ceiling, the increasing compression between the lower and higher salaries, and (3) to take into account the decline in the real income of many Federal employees.

The inequities and deficiencies existing in the present pay scales of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, should be corrected. Similar adjust-

ments should also be made in the pay schedules provided for employees subject to the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and employees in the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery who are subject to Public Law 293, the 79th Congress, as amended.

In a separate message submitted to the Congress today, I am recommending appropriate pay adjustments covering employees of the postal field service.

The recommended changes for the Classification Act group provide for an upward adjustment of pay rates for each grade, except that no change is recommended at this time in the ceiling pay rate of \$14,800. Emphasis is placed upon a greater and more meaningful differential between pay scales of successive grades. The proposal recognizes the fact that, in general, compensation rates in the lower grades of the Classification Act are fairly well in line with those prevailing outside the Federal Government while rates in the middle and upper grades have lagged behind.

Insofar as possible, adjustments in the Foreign Service and Veterans' Administration pay schedules should parallel the dollar amounts of pay adjustments provided for Classification Act employees at similar levels.

For Classification Act employees, the recommended pay adjustments would add an additional \$202 million or approximately 5 percent to present payroll costs. Even though the correction of inequities in the middle and upper pay levels is a primary objective of the Classification Act pay adjustments, 45.5 percent of the cost results from additional pay proposed for the lowest 5 grades. Only 4.5 percent will be applied in the highest 5 grades. The proposed pay schedules are presented in an appendix to this message.

Proposed changes for employees subject to the Foreign Service Act and those in the department of medicine and surgery of the Veterans' Administration, which are incorporated in the comprehensive proposal, will add approximately \$8,500,000 to the cost, making the over-all total approximately \$210,000,000.

The Classification Act of 1949, as amended, sets a ceiling on the number of positions that can be placed in grades 16, 17, and 18. Without regard to this ceiling, 19 other statutory authorities permit or require the establishment of additional positions in these 3 highest grades. The Classification Act limitation coupled with this complex array of other authorizations seriously hampers our ability to meet the changing needs of the Government. These conditions prevent sound pay administration and handicap the Federal service in recruiting and retaining top level personnel. Therefore, I am recommending the removal of this ceiling, and urge the consolidation of all existing authorities.

GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE

As another means for strengthening the Federal service, I propose for the consideration of the Congress a contributory system of voluntary health in-

surance for civilian employees in all branches of the Government and their dependents.

This contributory system has been designed to meet the requirements of the Federal service and to take into account the experience of private employers. The system would permit employees to choose either a standard plan of uniform benefits or an approved plan operating in an individual community when more suitable to employees in that location. It is proposed that the Government contribute approximately one-third the cost of the insurance for the employees and their dependents. It is estimated that the annual cost to the Government will be approximately \$55,000,000.

Under the standard plan, a comprehensive set of uniform benefits will be offered, including reimbursement for the costs of hospitalization, surgery, and other personal health services. The newest health insurance features, such as major medical or catastrophe coverage, are included. Appropriate provisions will be made for the continuance of substantial protection for employees and their dependents after they retire in the future—a valuable feature inasmuch as health insurance protection is frequently beyond the reach of those at the older ages.

Where the standard plan is not desired, provision is also made for employees in the various localities to purchase, with Government contributions, approved plans of health insurance especially suited to their needs.

All types of insurers are to be utilized under orderly processes established and supervised by the Civil Service Commission. This contributory system has been developed through the cooperative efforts of representatives of employee groups, insuring organizations and the leaders among the professions in the field of health.

EMPLOYEE TRAINING

Attainment of the greatest possible efficiency in governmental operations is a major goal of this administration. Achievement of this goal requires the effective use of training facilities outside as well as within Government to maintain a high level of competence in the Federal civilian career service.

Most civilian agencies of Government do not have comprehensive and adequate training programs, chiefly because there is no general statutory authority to use outside training facilities. Although it is clearly in the Government's interest to do so, many agencies now cannot send employees to private laboratories, industrial plants, universities, or State agencies for critically needed training in the use of new methods, techniques and machines.

A comprehensive training program should be authorized that will (1) permit Government agencies to use outside facilities for training required to meet operating needs when it is in the Government's interest, (2) consolidate in one law the training authorities now carried in many separate statutes, and (3) permit the establishment of Government-wide policies and effective

controls on the use of outside training facilities.

OVERSEAS PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

At present many different Government agencies conduct a wide variety of governmental functions in the Territories and foreign countries ranging from such activities as postal service and aid to veterans to such newer operations as economic and military aid and technical development programs. The development of sound personnel practices has not always been able to keep pace with the necessarily accelerated growth of Federal operations overseas.

The Civil Service Commission is now taking action, in cooperation with the Federal agencies concerned, to extend the competitive service to those operations overseas that should be included within the regular civil-service system. This will be done in the near future and does not require new legislation.

The State Department already has underway an action program designed to improve personnel administration in both its overseas and departmental activities at home. This program results from the recommendations made by a committee of distinguished citizens appointed by the Secretary of State in March 1954. Certain features of the program will require new legislation in the form of amendments to the Foreign

Service Act of 1946. These are now in preparation by the State Department.

There is also a need for improvements in certain conditions affecting all United States citizens employed overseas. Such matters as allowances, leave, housing, retirement, and health, and medical care as well as the whole range of problems posed by the management of alien personnel, require attention. As a first step, the Civil Service Commission will propose for consideration by the Congress comprehensive recommendations on allowances and leave for overseas personnel.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

The per diem allowance of \$9 for civilian employees who travel on official business was established in 1949. Since that time the cost of lodging, meals, and incidental expenses has increased. It is not fair to ask Government employees to defray part of their official travel and subsistence expenses from their personal funds. Recommendations soon will be submitted to the Congress for an appropriate increase in the present rate.

The various measures, described in this message, are essential to the further improvement of the Federal career service. I earnestly urge that the necessary legislation be enacted by the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 11, 1955.

APPENDIX

Analysis of proposed schedules, Classification Act of 1949, as amended

GENERAL SCHEDULE

	Present		Proposed		Increase over present entrance rate ¹		Aggregate increase	Progression of new minimum rate amount
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum	Amount	Percent		
1.....	\$2,500	\$2,080	\$2,625	\$3,165	\$125	5.0	\$791,500	-----
2.....	2,750	3,230	2,885	3,365	135	4.9	13,111,875	\$260
3.....	2,950	3,430	3,100	3,580	150	5.1	27,246,300	215
4.....	3,175	3,655	3,340	3,820	165	5.2	21,871,905	240
5.....	3,410	4,160	3,600	4,350	190	5.6	17,783,620	260
6.....	3,795	4,545	4,000	4,750	205	5.4	7,520,835	400
7.....	4,205	4,955	4,415	5,165	210	5.0	18,642,960	415
8.....	4,620	5,370	4,850	5,600	230	5.0	4,956,960	435
9.....	5,060	5,810	5,300	6,050	240	4.7	18,887,600	450
10.....	5,500	6,250	5,800	6,550	300	5.5	4,114,800	500
11.....	5,940	6,940	6,300	7,300	360	6.1	18,927,720	500
12.....	7,040	8,040	7,500	8,500	460	6.5	16,528,720	1,200
13.....	8,360	9,360	8,800	9,800	440	5.3	9,570,880	1,300
14.....	9,600	10,600	10,200	11,200	600	6.3	5,239,200	1,400
15.....	10,800	11,800	11,600	12,600	800	7.4	3,240,000	1,400
16.....	12,000	12,800	12,800	13,600	800	6.7	373,600	1,200
17.....	13,000	13,800	13,800	14,600	800	6.2	143,200	1,000
18.....	14,800	14,800	14,800	14,800	0	0	0	1,000

CRAFTS, PROTECTIVE, AND CUSTODIAL SCHEDULE

1.....	\$1,810	\$2,170	\$1,885	\$2,245	\$75	4.1	\$1,800	-----
2.....	2,420	2,840	2,495	2,915	75	3.1	1,868,325	\$610
3.....	2,552	3,032	2,625	3,105	73	2.9	1,603,445	130
4.....	2,750	3,230	2,885	3,365	135	4.9	1,717,470	260
5.....	2,974	3,454	3,100	3,580	126	4.2	1,552,446	215
6.....	3,200	3,680	3,340	3,820	140	4.4	2,645,160	240
7.....	3,435	4,035	3,600	4,200	165	4.8	1,603,635	260
8.....	3,740	4,490	4,000	4,750	260	7.0	1,319,500	400
9.....	4,150	4,900	4,415	5,165	265	6.4	462,425	415
10.....	4,565	5,315	4,850	5,600	285	6.2	409,260	435

¹ Each rate of the respective grade increased by same dollar amount, GS-18, single rate of \$14,800, unchanged.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT SALARIES AND POSTAL RATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 65)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was

read, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Post Office Department, in its daily operations, affects the entire life of the Republic from the family home to the great industry. A vast business-type

enterprise within Government, the Post Office Department, consequently, requires a continuing vigilance that its methods, practices, and policies assure the most efficient possible service to the public. The measures recommended in this message are designed to that end.

Last August 23 in announcing my disapproval of H. R. 7774, "An act to increase the rates of compensation of classified, postal, and other employees of the Government, and for other purposes," I expressed a purpose to continue to encourage the enactment of legislation to correct obvious distortions in the pay scales of the postal service and to provide for a more proper and effective relationship between pay and work performed.

I also pointed out the necessity of adequate postage rates in order to check a deficit in the operation of the Post Office Department which, since World War II, has reached the staggering total of more than four billions of dollars.

An increase in the average wage of postal employees along with correction of the serious inequities in the salary structure is an essential step in bringing the wage scale into line with nongovernmental standards and in furthering the progressive personnel program to which the administration is committed. The increase must be accompanied by a salary plan which will place the wages for postal service positions in proper relationship to each other so that inequities will be eliminated, incentive for advancement offered, and the principle of higher pay for more difficult and responsible work followed.

In order to accomplish these objectives, the Postmaster General will submit to the Congress a new postal salary plan along with a 5-percent increase in basic salary rates. This plan will include reasonably detailed descriptions of the series of key positions to which the great majority of postal employees are assigned. A rate range for each of these positions will be recommended, and together this series of rate ranges will make up a related, uniform, and equitable salary schedule.

The Congress will be asked to include the key position descriptions and their appropriate salary ranges in the legislation, thus assigning specific wage rates to the bulk of the positions common to all offices of the postal service.

The Post Office Department should then be granted the authority to allocate the remaining positions, held by the relatively few employees whose work is not covered by a key position, to the proper level in the salary schedule on the basis of a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of these positions with the duties and responsibilities of the key positions.

In the allocation of the positions other than the key positions to the proper salary level an appeal procedure will be provided. Further, to insure that the salary plan will not work to the disadvantage of any employee, the legislation proposed will incorporate a guaranty against reduction of salary so long as the employee occupies the same or a position comparable to that which he held at the time of the installation of the plan.

This legislation would eliminate the inequities inherent in the present inflexible system which requires assignment of all employees to a limited number of job titles, in many cases having no relation to the work actually performed. The present practice of paying salaries to some employees on the basis of the number of cubic feet in the area they supervise, or solely in relation to the number of employees under their direction, would be replaced by a system requiring that salaries be based on the actual duties and responsibilities of the position.

Under this plan, postmasters of the Nation would receive salaries commensurate with the volume of work and the level of the responsibility of their offices rather than solely on the basis of cash receipts which presently govern their compensation. This practice results in discrimination against those holding offices where incoming mail represents most of the business volume.

The total cost of wage adjustments in the postal service is estimated at \$129,000,000 a year. I recommend adoption of legislation incorporating these proposals.

The 83d Congress authorized appropriations to be made for the furnishing of uniforms or the payment of an annual allowance to employees, including those of the Post Office Department, required by law or regulation to wear a prescribed uniform while on official duty. This measure, when Congress makes funds available, will benefit post office employees by an estimated \$13,500,000 a year.

I am recommending in another special message today a health insurance plan to round out the Federal personnel benefits program enacted by the 83d Congress. This program already has provided group life insurance, unemployment compensation, elimination of restrictions on permanent promotions and reinstatements, adjustment of the statutory limit on the number of career employees, elimination of arbitrary restrictions on accumulation of annual leave, and a liberalized incentive awards system.

I wish to reaffirm my position that sound fiscal management requires consideration of revenues as well as costs. To this end, I am requesting that Congress also consider legislation to adjust postal rates to provide needed revenue.

The combined postal deficits of the 156 years of our history as a nation, up to 1945, are far less than the losses sustained in the last 9 years. The anomaly of this situation is that the period which has witnessed this recordbreaking deficit in the operation of the postal service has also been a decade of unprecedented national prosperity. Employment, production and use of the mails have been at an all time high and yet postal deficits have occurred year after year. Clearly it is time to reaffirm the need for sound fiscal management of the Post Office Department and to develop a positive program toward this end.

In fiscal 1954 the Post Office Department received revenues of \$2,268,000,000 for services performed at a cost of \$2,667,000,000, thus leaving a deficit of \$399,000,000 in its operation. The services performed by the Post Office De-

partment are of measurable value to the recipients. When the rates of postal services fail to provide sufficient revenues to meet the total cost of the service, the difference must be made up by general tax revenues.

A practice of this kind is neither equitable nor reasonable; it is neither good business nor good government. Even if a case could be made for regarding the postal patron and the taxpayer as one and the same, prudence and good sense would compel us to face the fact that it is far more efficient to collect the necessary revenues in direct exchange for services at the post-office window than by the more costly methods of general taxation.

The Post Office is constantly working to reduce the deficit by improving the efficiency of its operations. During the last 2 years substantial progress has been made in organization, mail handling, transportation, mechanization, record keeping, and accounting methods. The Postmaster General has also taken the initiative in increasing rates and fees within his jurisdiction.

As a result of these measures there has been a recent reversal of the postwar trend of ever-increasing postal deficits. These are the operating deficits for each of the last 5 years:

Fiscal year:	Operating deficit
1950-----	\$589,500,000
1951-----	551,500,000
1952-----	727,000,000
1953-----	618,800,000
1954-----	399,100,000

The large deficits in the postwar years are, in part, a direct consequence of the same inflationary increases in costs which all business operations have faced. Private business has increased prices of goods and services to offset increased costs of production. The Post Office operates in the same economic climate as private business. It must meet rising costs in very much the same way.

Since 1945, the largest part of the increase in postal expenditures is accounted for by salary increases legislated by Congress, as follows:

Date	Public Law	Annual increase in cost to Post Office Department
July 1, 1945-----	134	\$178,767,000
Do-----	106	786,000
Jan. 1, 1946-----	381	190,631,000
July 1, 1946-----	390	684,000
Nov. 1, 1949-----	{ 428 }	112,489,000
Do-----	500	278,000
July 1, 1951-----	429	248,600,000
July 8, 1951-----	204	1,100,000
	201	

These wage adjustments, combined with an expansion in the number of postal employees necessary to handle the greater volume of mail, have resulted in an increase in total salary costs from \$858,000,000 in 1945 to \$2,002,000,000 in the last fiscal year.

The increases in wages and other costs since the end of World War II have affected all classes of mail. It is desirable that the rates governing each class of mail be advanced in fair proportion. The committees of Congress responsible for postal-rate legislation will, of course, want to consider carefully the specific

rates for each class of mail. The Postmaster General will soon submit to Congress, in addition to his views on increases in postal pay, detailed recommendations for raising postal rates to more reasonable levels. I wish to emphasize at this time a few of the major considerations which seem to me important in raising rates.

1. First-class mail has always provided by far the greater part of postal revenues. In 1933 the revenue contribution of first-class mail was more than 55 percent of total post office revenues. In the last fiscal year first-class mail provided only 40 percent of such revenues, although the proportion of first-class volume to the total volume was only 3 percentage points lower than in the earlier year. The failure of this type mail to maintain its revenue contribution is a major factor in the present postal deficit. There is, therefore, an urgent need to increase the rate of postage of first-class mail.

Postal rates are payments made by users of the mails for services received. The rate established for each service should reflect the value of that service in terms of speed, priority of handling, and the privileges incorporated in each class of mail. If these factors are taken into consideration in ratemaking, the revenue contribution of first-class mail is clearly inadequate.

The privacy, security, and swift dispatch of letter mail; the priority of service at all times, in all places; and the intrinsic value of such mail are factors which are pertinent to postal ratemaking in addition to the cost factor.

But the present 3-cent rate for first-class letter mail has not been increased in almost a quarter of a century. During this period the costs of all goods and services have almost doubled. I am convinced that the American people will understand, appreciate, respect, and support congressional action to provide for a long-overdue rate increase on letter mail which will go far toward balancing the postal budget.

2. The revenues derived from second-class mail are clearly inadequate. These rates which apply to newspapers and magazines should be increased until such matter makes a fair and reasonable contribution to postal revenues. The Postmaster General will recommend a two-step increase in second-class rates which will enable publishers to adjust more readily to the proposed rate changes.

3. Third-class mail consists largely of advertising matter. In fiscal year 1954 the revenue contribution of such mail fell substantially below the cost of providing this service and was a major factor contributing to the postal deficit. The rates of postage on such matter should be increased so that the users of this class of mail pay a proportionately fair share of postal revenues.

In view of the recurring fiscal problems of the Post Office Department, and of the heavy burden which postal deficits continue to impose on the Federal Treasury, I strongly recommend to Congress the formal adoption of a policy which will insure that in the future the Post

Office Department will be essentially self-supporting.

Certain services which are performed by the post office, such as those for the blind, are a part of general welfare services. The cost of such services should not be borne by users of the mails. Expenditures for them, and for services performed for the Government, should be identified and met by direct appropriation.

If the post office is successfully to meet the challenge of the future its prices must be sufficiently flexible to reflect changes in costs and the developing needs of a dynamic economy. It is my belief that an independent commission entrusted with the authority to establish and maintain fair and equitable postal rates can best provide this needed flexibility.

There are also other advantages. Such a commission, guided by policies laid down by the Congress, would have the time and facilities to make thorough analytical studies before prescribing rate changes. A commission well versed in the economics of modern pricing practices can continuously appraise and re-appraise the soundness of the postal-rate structure. Legislation to secure these ends should be enacted by Congress.

With these views in mind I recommend to Congress the adoption of a temporary increase in postal rates as an interim measure and the establishment and activation within the interim period of a permanent commission to prescribe future rate adjustments under broad policy guidance of Congress.

Let me reiterate—the financial problems of the postal service result, in large measure, from lack of a positive program leading toward a well-defined fiscal goal. I am, therefore, recommending to Congress the following five-point program for the Post Office Department:

1. Approval of the new salary plan and a 5-percent increase in basic salary rates.

2. Adoption by Congress of the policy that henceforth the Post Office Department shall be self-supporting.

3. Separation of those postal costs to be paid by the patron from those costs which should be paid by general taxation.

4. Establishment by Congress of a permanent commission authorized to prescribe postal-rate adjustments under policy guidance of Congress.

5. Enactment by Congress of an interim rate bill which will, pending activation of the Rate Commission, provide immediate revenue to meet proposed pay increases and reduce the postal deficit.

Approval of this program will be in the public interest for it will further assure efficient service by the Post Office Department.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 11, 1955.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 81) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 6, 1955, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to the special employee, Office of the Doorkeeper, at the basic rate of \$700 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 82) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 6, 1955, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to the two floor managers of telephones (one for the minority), Doorkeeper's Department, at the basic rate of \$500 per annum each in addition to the total basic amount they are now receiving.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE KENT E. KELLER

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of Kent E. Keller, a former distinguished Member of this House. Mr. Keller passed away at his home in Ava, Ill., on September 3, 1954, a few miles away from the log cabin in which he was born.

Kent Keller served the people of Illinois in the 72d to the 76th Congresses; a number of his colleagues who mourn his passing are here today.

An able and energetic man, Kent Keller called on the variety of his experience as a teacher, newspaperman, writer, and lecturer, as well as on his background and training in the law, to become the benefactor of the 25th District of Illinois. His accomplishments were many and of the highest order, and always had the welfare of the people as their basis. When he assumed office, there were no bridges over the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in his area; when he left, there were many. A veterans' hospital was built, and so were other projects during his tenure, such as a large defense plant, known as Crab Orchard Lake. Yet Kent Keller was far from being only local in his interests and efforts.

Legislation worked for by Kent Keller resulted in greater equity in wage and work-hour conditions for labor; in the establishment of the National Archives Building here in Washington; constantly he worked for assistance to the unemployed throughout our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in my own hometown of West Frankfort, Franklin County, in the

great State of Illinois, I can look around in any direction and see the accomplishments achieved by Kent Keller, the man from Ava, Ill., to whom not only the people of Illinois but also the people of our Nation owe grateful memory. For no greater tribute can be paid to anyone than to say, "The welfare of others was his greatest concern."

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my remarks to those of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] in paying tribute to the memory of a great son of Illinois, the Honorable Kent E. Keller.

Everyone who knew Kent Keller loved him. When I heard of his passing it was with a grieving heart.

Kent Keller served in this Chamber as a Member of the 72d, 73d, 74th, 75th, and 76th Congresses. No Congressman ever did more or got more for his district and its people. As a freshman he surprised older and experienced colleagues by getting a total of 42 young women from his district jobs with the Library of Congress. Through his efforts a large Federal project, Crab Orchard Creek Dam, was started in his district, entailing an expenditure of some \$82 million and opening southern Illinois to industry.

He was the close friend and counselor of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and either fathered or was active in the support of many major legislative measures of the first rich decade of the Rooseveltian era.

He will be remembered by old Chicagoans and surviving victims of the real-estate bond tragedy as their fighting friend and champion when the Congress, responding to their petition with a million signatures which they commissioned me to bring to Washington, created a select committee to inquire into their grievances. The late beloved Congressman A. J. Sabath was the chairman of that committee and both Sabath and Keller did a herculean job that gave to many thousand plundered and penniless holders of \$8 billion in defaulted real-estate bonds the first glimpse of sunshine in a long night of depression and black hopelessness.

In 1940 the district for which he had done so much failed him. By a narrow vote he was defeated for membership in the 77th Congress. He tried again in 1942, again in 1944. President Roosevelt dispatched him to Mexico City for 2 years of outstanding service as special adviser to the United States Ambassador. Then back to his beloved home at Ava in Jackson County, the home with the garden of roses famous for miles around, and another try for his old seat in the Congress. Again in 1948 he tried and again the smile of political fortune was denied him.

The last time I saw Kent was in 1950. It was shortly before the date of the Democratic primaries. Kent was going

back to make another valiant battle. He was then 83 years old, tall, erect, majestic in bearing, still an optimist, still every inch of him a fighter.

He shook my hand warmly—I felt in his clasp an unworded message of an affection of four decades of friendship—as we parted.

"I'll be back," he said in parting. "They won't fail me this time. I'll be back in the 82d Congress and together you and I will be in a legislative body, catching up where we left off in the old Senate Chamber at Springfield."

Kent did win in the primary election that year. The party organization was not with him, the nod going to a younger man. But Kent, fighting it out on his own, won the day in the primaries. He thought fate at long last was to smile upon him as it had in earlier years. He put everything that he had into the election campaign. But again the fruit of victory was denied him.

It was Kent Keller's last battle. After that he gave more and more of his time to his books, to the friends who came to Ava as pilgrims to a shrine of democracy, and to his garden of roses. It was there among the roses, the patch of flowers of his cultivation and his love, that the stroke, ending in his death, came.

I have hanging on my wall a photograph of the State Senate of Illinois of which Kent Keller was a brilliantly distinguished member, and of which I was honored to be the president. The late Honorable Morton D. Hull, later for 5 terms a Member of this body from the district I now represent, and the late Honorable Niel Juul, for 2 terms a Member of this body, also served in the Illinois Senate of many years ago, the picture of which hangs in my office to hearten and to inspire me in the activities of the present by memories of the great statesmen and great Americans of the Woodrow Wilson era.

To the young man whose maiden speech in the well of this House was to remark the passing of Kent Keller, I wish to say that had my beloved friend and our late colleague been privileged to be here in understanding consciousness, he would have said with me that no speaker could have conveyed a message of bereavement and of tribute with more feeling and eloquence and framed in better diction. Kent Keller would be proud that the first Democrat from his district since Kent's defeat in 1940 is so well equipped to carry on for our democracy and our people where the gallant battler left off.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF THE NARCOTICS DIVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld of the United Nations has before him a recommendation of the Third Committee at the U. N. to transfer the United Nations' Narcotics Division from New York to Geneva. This proposal is clearly not in the best interests of the United States, the United Nations, or of the effective control of the illicit narcotics traffic.

The reasons for suggesting the transfer to Geneva are shrouded in deep political mystery. There are many offices or divisions of the U. N. which could be taken out of this country. Why was the Narcotics Division selected? This is all the more strange when one realizes that President Eisenhower recently appointed a special interdepartmental committee to review and coordinate the Federal Government's programs to combat narcotic addiction in this country. In a letter from the White House to Secretary Humphrey, dated November 27, 1954, the President said:

Receipt of the committee's report on both subjects (to define more clearly the scope of the problems which we face and to promote effective cooperation among Federal, State, and local agencies) as promptly as possible will expedite systematic review and improvement of our narcotics programs—local, national, and international.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would be most unwise for the Secretary General to effect this transfer, and a grave mistake to do it before the President's committee has an opportunity to report. Our most effective work in combating this terrible evil may call for an energetic international office in this country. To eliminate at this time the New York division of the U. N. with its specialized laboratory could be disastrous. The United States for years has been the world leader in opposition to the illicit dope traffic. Right now the problem is as serious as ever. Recognizing this the American Legion, Department of California, through its commander, Mr. Malcolm M. Champlin wrote Mr. Hammarskjöld on December 2, 1954, as follows. I include the first two paragraphs of his letter:

The American Legion of California has noted a press report a few days ago of the proposal to transfer the United Nations Narcotic Division from New York to Geneva.

We wish to protest this move on the grounds that the United States has a serious narcotic problem which is due entirely to the international illicit traffic, and that there are many international narcotic treaties being administered by the United Nations in New York which attempt to stop the smuggling of narcotics from abroad to the State of California. We, therefore, consider it vitally important to retain at the United Nations headquarters in New York its Narcotic Division in order to maintain close cooperation with the United States, which

is one of the most important victim countries of this traffic. We feel that the transfer to Geneva will result in a psychological defeat for your narcotic program, and we predict that if this transfer goes through it will result in a decided lessening of international narcotic controls.

It is quite evident that the transfer of the Narcotic Division to Geneva would remove it from the watchful eye of American newspapermen and that its efforts would receive less news coverage. Likewise, it will be removed from a country which is vitally interested in the strictest control of narcotics.

The man probably most interested in this problem, Commissioner of Narcotics H. J. Anslinger, wrote me on December 30, 1954, to say:

We are not in favor of this transfer.

The recent chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, has been deeply concerned with this proposed transfer. On November 9, 1954, he wrote our Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, saying:

I cannot help but feel that in view of the fact that the preponderant effect on narcotics research and on enforcement effort against worldwide illicit traffic is made by the United States, that the Division should definitely be kept here in this country.

I certainly hope that the Secretary-General will give considerable weight to the opinion of these distinguished gentlemen. In fighting this international evil the U. N. needs the complete cooperation and assistance of the United States and the United States needs the same from the United Nations. This mutual cooperation and assistance will not be increased by moving the U. N. Narcotics Division to Geneva.

Not only does this proposed transfer come at a time when the President's interdepartmental committee is at work, but it follows shortly on the return of Clement Attlee from Red China. The France-Turkey-United Kingdom resolution passed in Committee Three seems to have resulted from some of the information Mr. Attlee obtained on his visit. We should insist that nothing be done by the U. N. which would in any way increase the influence of Red China either in the U. N. or in the world at large. We in the United States must be alert to any effort by the Chinese Communists to decrease the effectiveness of international control of the illicit narcotic traffic. Not only are the lives of our children and young people involved, but also those of many other enlightened nations of the world.

Some will say that this is an economy measure and that money will be saved by building a laboratory in Geneva and transferring all narcotic work to the Switzerland city. This claim cannot stand close scrutiny. It will take many years to amortize the additional cost, estimated at \$25,000, required for moving to Geneva.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that Secretary-General Hammarskjöld exercise his prerogative to keep the Narcotics Division in New York. We cannot risk weakening an effective

weapon against an international enemy; we do not want to endanger the lives of potential victims of the vicious dope peddlers by neglecting to protest this move. I ask my colleagues to urge the Secretary-General to keep this Division in New York. We want to see nothing done which will weaken the power of the U. N. or which will cause the people of the United States to be less enthusiastic in their support of the United Nations.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am not quite ready to make my speech. I ask unanimous consent to address the House today at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

JOSEPH B. KEENAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our country enjoys the services of many men of profound talent and achievement—and even greatness—who, while not without recognition, are rarely accorded the eminent place in history which it seems to me they abundantly deserve. One of these distinguished citizens who served his country well and mightily was Joseph B. Keenan who died on December 8, 1954, in Asheboro, N. C. I cannot let his passing go without some memorial—if only in the form of brief and simple words—in the Congress of the United States. For Joe Keenan was not only a patriot whose great abilities were given to his country at the peak of his career, but he was my friend and the friend of many here in the Congress to whom his death strikes deep bereavement.

Keenan's friendship had a certain special dignity because—speaking from personal knowledge—it was interwoven with his love of country and his loyalty to his job, his loyalty to his chief—whether it was a senior law partner or the President of the United States—and, most of all his loyalty to his deeply held principles and his deep religious faith. Someone said that a friend should be one in whose understanding and virtue we can equally confide, and whose opinion we can value at once for its justness and its sincerity. Those lines may well

serve as a kind of epitaph for Joe Keenan. But here I must add that Joe Keenan was not some cold and aloof embodiment of all the virtues cast in chilly marble but rather a warm and ingratiating human being whose talk had wit and candor and whose personality sparkled with the thinking of an educated man who could be cordial as well as courteous and who enjoyed his fellow man as his fellow man enjoyed him.

Seeing it in retrospect, Keenan's life, before he achieved national fame, seems to have been a preparation—as if by God's design—for the several jobs he eventually performed for his State, his country, and for justice on the international stage. He was born in Pawtucket, R. I., the neighbor State to my own Massachusetts, getting his degrees in due course from Brown University and the Harvard Law School. He served with the cavalry—an almost forgotten military term these days—on the Mexican border. In World War I he served in France and his natural proclivity for the law soon found him in the office of the Judge Advocate General. His civil career really began in Cleveland where he headed the law firm of Keenan & Butler after a tour of duty with Day, Day, & Wilkin.

The fighting tenacity of Joe Keenan emerged first perhaps to the point of public recognition when Gov. James M. Cox selected him to stand at the side of the Ohio attorney general and clean up the crime problems plaguing Cleveland. That was the beginning of his spectacular and successful career as one of the first of the Nation's foremost "gangbusters," a title the newspapers of the country and the magazines were soon to give him. It was purely in the logic of events that the then United States Attorney General under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt—Homer S. Cummings—should bring Keenan to Washington as a special assistant to bust up the cloud of crime and kidnappings that afflicted the Nation. With even more sensational success and on an even more enduring level Joe Keenan did for his country what he had just completed doing for Cleveland. He deadened the impact of crime in the United States. Many a gangster and hoodlum, many a kidnaper and killer, was rendered harmless behind prison walls because, so to speak, Keenan had picked him up by the scruff of the neck and the seat of the pants and removed him from society. Where the Federal law was weak he strengthened it, where it was lacking he helped to create it. And the Congress after due deliberation and in accordance with its own final judgment enacted the measures it found fit to accept on his recommendation.

That is what I mean when I use the word "enduring," for Joe Keenan's usefulness to the American people lives today in the statutory law of the land. It was, of course, in this very Chamber that the laws he framed were debated and passed, as they were in the Senate. The now live and potent Lindbergh kidnapping law which stands as a threatening deterrent to every would-be kidnaper was of Joe Keenan's making. But for

the overwhelming tragedy that precipitated it and the famous name the tragedy involves it might well have been called today the Keenan law. A new dynamism electrified the Department of Justice and in a matter of weeks and months the long arm of retribution developed the speed and the sinews it needed to stop crime dead in its tracks. There are 10 crime laws he either authored, sponsored, or fought for and which owe their existence more or less to his initiative and dogged determination.

Attorney General Cummings, to be sure, had moved Joe Keenan up to head the Criminal Division in the Department of Justice.

It was again inherent in the logic of events that Joe Keenan should come to the attention of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who had no mean genius at picking good men and who soon began to refer to Keenan as "Joe the Key." His canny judgment and unique quality for mingling candor with tact made him an ideal liaison man when the White House had a particularly important and delicate program for which it sought support on the Hill. I am sure that when duty and loyalty to his Chief demanded it—consonant with his patriotic convictions—he performed as an advocate for the White House whatever his own views may have been.

For many of us evaluating the life of Joseph B. Keenan it must seem that his outstanding service in history was his prosecution of the Japanese war crimes cases, a job to which President Harry Truman appointed him. It was perhaps the most arduous and the most exacting of the tasks which had been tossed in his competent lap and he plunged into it with indefatigable energy and directness. That story is a great chapter in the annals of our time. Seven Japanese war criminals including War Premier Hideki Tojo—Japanese leaders who had caused untold horror to the world and to our troops went to their justly sentenced death. There was a period between 1939 and 1945 when Joe Keenan returned to the private practice of the law. But there can be no doubt about it that the most productive period of his life as a great lawyer was given to his country. Joe Keenan understood politics and was a great publicist for the causes he espoused. His work as a prosecutor and author of legislation contributed to the internal safety of the Nation and the American home. For many of us here today he was a familiar and popular figure in Washington and an immensely dependable one.

This is for me—gentlemen of the Congress—a reverent moment and I cannot help but feel that the hearts of many of his friends are right now in the grave with Joseph B. Keenan.

WHY WE NEED AN ADEQUATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about small business, what usually happens is that each of us is thinking in terms of his own peculiar imagery. The picture each of us usually has in mind is some particular business firm or group of firms that we have come to think of as typical of small business. We frequently forget how many small businesses there are, and what a wide variety of activity they are engaged in. What is more important, we sometimes forget why it is that we must preserve small business. Consequently, we sometimes lose a sense of proportion concerning the things that require our attention, and concerning the adequacy of the things we do to insure that kind of climate to which small business can adapt itself shall be preserved.

I should like, briefly, to remind the Members of a few facts and precepts which help to put these matters in perspective.

IMPORTANCE OF SMALL BUSINESS

All told, there are about 4 million business firms in the United States—the total business population as of the end of 1953 is estimated by the Department of Commerce to be 4.2 million. See also Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, January 1954, page 11. This is not counting professional offices, such as doctors' and dentists' offices and law firms. Of these 4 million firms, more than 3 million are firms which have 3 or less paid employees—all data relating to size distribution of firms by number of employees are from Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, May 1954, page 15 and the following. Many of these, of course, have no paid employees. The proprietor and other members of the family do all the work.

Perhaps we can get a better grasp of these figures if we recall that there are less than 5½ million farm families in the United States—data on number of farm families are by telephone to the Farm Population Division, Department of Agriculture, January 5, 1954. I shall not develop the point, but I invite you to compare, in your own minds, the amount of necessary attention we give to farmers, and the amount of Federal money properly spent on agriculture—on the Department of Agriculture, the county agents, the experiment stations and research laboratories, on the conservation and other programs—with the amount of attention and assistance given to small business. I am not suggesting that the attention and assistance given to farmers is too much. On the contrary, the point of my remarks will be that the House should at least continue the life of its committee for keeping itself informed about small business, and that this committee should be given funds which are in some wise adequate to the job of keeping you informed.

Coming back to the figures, we find that about 95 percent of the 4 million business firms have less than 20 paid employees, and about 98 percent have less than 50 paid employees—Survey of Current Business, May 1954, page 15 and the following.

These small firms—which are the overwhelming majority of all firms—are scattered throughout almost every con-

ceivable line of business. In every major division of business—in mining and quarrying; in contract construction; in manufacturing; in transportation, communication, and other public utilities; in wholesale and retail trade; in finance, insurance, and real estate; and in the service industries—a major share of the operating businesses are quite small. Tiny firms, firms with less than 4 employees, account for more than 60 percent of the firms in every division, with the exception of manufacturing—Survey of Current Business, May 1954, page 15 and the following. And even in manufacturing, such firms account for more than 42 percent—Survey of Current Business, May 1954, page 15 and the following. These figures are from a very excellent study published by the Department of Commerce, and they are as of 1951. They are, however, sufficiently up to date for our purpose here. An official of the Department has expressed an opinion that the figures would not have changed very much by December of 1954.

FEW CONTROL MOST BUSINESS

Now there is another side to the coin. Business firms are not the same as amount of business done. A lion's share of all the business done in the United States is controlled by a very few but very large corporate empires. Quite a few corporations have more than 10,000 employees apiece. They account for less than one-tenth of 1 percent of all the business firms, but they also account for more than 38 percent of all the paid employees—Survey of Current Business, May 1954, page 15 and the following. By this count, moreover, each subsidiary in the corporate family is counted as a separate firm. If we had combined figures we would find even fewer firms at the top of the heap, but accounting for well over half of all the employees.

Turning to the reports of Internal Revenue, we find that for the year 1951 about 650,000 corporations reported assets totaling \$648 billion—asset and income data are from Internal Revenue Service, Statistics of Income for 1951, part 2. A few of the corporations, 757 of them, each had assets of more than \$100 million. And these assets totaled \$336 billion, or more than half of all the corporate assets. Some 551 corporations reported net incomes—not sales, but profits—of more than \$10 million each. And altogether the net income of these 551 totaled \$22 billion, or about half of all the corporate net income. Here, too, the figures are not fully consolidated for the various subsidiaries of the same corporations.

CONCENTRATION OF BUSINESS

If we had time to examine this matter further, we would find that no large sector of business is typically small business, and conversely there is no sector of business which has not been invaded by the big corporations.

It was only about two generations ago that big corporations appeared in more than a few sectors of business. This was after a few Wall-streeters and stock manipulators began buying up and merging large numbers of independent companies. Since that time, business has

become more and more concentrated into the hands of the few. There have been new small businesses of course, and in recent years there have been more business firms in operation than ever before. But the growth of small business has not kept pace with the general growth of business. This has continued to be true up to and through World War II, although in the later years the big corporations did not take over at so rapid a pace as in the earlier decades of this century. Studies made for the years 1935 and 1950 show that several industries became highly concentrated in this period, whereas they had been small business industries before—data on changes in concentration of manufacturing are 1935 to 1950 and are from Federal Trade Commission. In manufacturing as a whole, the 200 largest corporations produced 37.7 percent of all the manufactured goods produced in 1935—data on changes in concentration of manufacturing are 1935 to 1950 and are from Federal Trade Commission. In 1950 this percentage rose to 40.5 percent—data on changes in concentration of manufacturing are 1935 to 1950 and are from Federal Trade Commission. This was a significant increase in concentration, when we consider that there was a great growth in business between the depression year of 1935 and the boom year 1950. In periods of business decline, it is inevitable that small business loses out. Consequently, in periods of business expansion, small business would have to make gains just to hold its own over the long stretch. In the post-World War II years, small business has, we think, about held its own. Although this too has been a period of expansion, when gains should have been made. Up through 1952, small business was in a fairly sound position. It was in some measure, in a position to expand.

FACING NEW PERIOD OF BUSINESS EXPANSION

We are now coming into a new period of business expansion—or so we hope. That is the administration's announced hope, and presumably the administration's policies will be keyed to this objective. But small business is not now in a position to make its proportionate share of the new expansion. In 1952 small-business profits compared not too unfavorably with big-business profits. In the first half of that year, the rate of profits—after taxes—of the smallest size class of manufacturers was almost on a parity with the biggest manufacturers. Those firms with less than one-fourth million dollars of assets were making profits at an annual rate of 10.6 percent after taxes—rates of profits are computed as percentages of stockholders' equity. They are from Federal Trade Commission and Security and Exchange Commission, Quarterly Financial Report, second quarter, 1954. The biggest firms, those having more than \$100 million of assets, had a corresponding profit rate of 11.8 percent. In the first half of 1954, profits of the smallest group had dropped to 4.1 percent, while the rate for the biggest corporations had increased to 12 percent. This was after the new tax law took effect. In other words, in the course of 2 short years

profits after taxes of the smallest manufacturers dropped 61 percent, while corresponding profits of the biggest firms increased by 6 percent.

DETERMINE CAUSE OF SHIFT IN PROFITS

Your Small Business Committee should look into this matter, and try to find out what is behind this shift in profits. And there are many other important matters that need looking into. These are complex matters. We live in a complex age; the economic forces, the laws, the rules and regulations, the executive policies affecting business are all complex—and they are interrelated.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE FOR 14 YEARS IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Small Business Committee, which has now been in existence for 14 years, is not a legislative committee. And I am not now asking that it be made a legislative committee. The great need, and the proper function of a small-business committee, is to specialize in understanding the problems of small business in all of their interrelated aspects, and to call attention of the appropriate legislative committees to the effects upon small business, of specific legislative proposals. It is the Small Business Committee of the House that several million small businesses have come to look to, over the years, for this wholesome and proper function.

Now, in nothing I have said have I given or intended to give a precise definition of small business. That is a complicated subject, and needs no precise definition here. It is not as if we had to draw a boundary line and declare that business on one side of the line is friend and that on the other is foe. Obviously, it will always be the policy of Congress to help all business, large and small. We are not out to destroy big business; we merely wish to see, and we must see, that in the course of our decisions as to how the economic pie shall be cut, who shall have the advantages and who the disadvantages, small business is given an opportunity to keep pace in the race.

WHY SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE?

Why, then, do we need a special committee to be the eyes and ears of small business? The answer is—and I say this only for the benefit of some of the new Members—big business has fully adequate ways of knowing what is going on here in Washington, and of making its wishes known. You will come to learn that big business has lobbyists on top of lobbyists, and they are expert lobbyists. Big firms have, right here, expert legal counsel, expert public-relations counsel, and expert counsels of other kinds. And elsewhere they have facilities for making their wishes known in both direct and indirect ways. They control national organizations, they have special organizations that can, when the occasion demands, create grassroot lobbies. They have trade journals and powerful advertising organizations.

Altogether, about \$7 billion a year is spent on advertising in this country. This sum is almost equal to the cost of all the civilian functions of the Federal Government, including all other subsidies to big business. I will not call this \$7 billion spent on advertising waste, but

I will, as a Harvard economist has done, refer to it as "fat" in our economic system. The same economist has pointed out that if we were a poor Nation, where everybody had to work to produce sufficient beans and potatoes and other necessities of life, we would not have to spend so much money to persuade people to buy things they don't know they want—see Kenneth Galbraith, *American Capitalism: The Concept of Countervailing Power*.

This \$7 billion spent for advertising is mostly spent by big business. It is the lifeblood of the communications business—the radio, the television, the national magazines, and the newspapers. It would be surprising, therefore, if these media were not influenced to a big business point of view.

It is even thought that big business may have some high representation in the present administration.

IF A FEW GIANTS CONTROL

We do not know what the result will be if a few giant corporations come to control all of the economic activities of this country. Perhaps we would have fewer problems to worry our heads about if we lived under an economic oligarchy, where all of our decisions would be made for us by a hidden, self-perpetuating management which is largely divorced even from any ownership control. But, certainly, this would mean a radical change in our form of government. One of the fundamental precepts upon which our form of government is based is that power shall be largely diffused among the people. This has, from the very beginning of this Nation, been recognized to mean both economic power and political power, for the two are inseparable.

Small business also needs a way of communicating with its House of Representatives. I hope that you will continue your interest in the several million small-business firms of the country by continuing the life of your Small Business Committee, and by providing it with adequate funds.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE CHANGES IN BUSINESS PROFITS?

We have all been reading that business profits held up remarkably well in 1954. The preliminary indications are, moreover, that this will prove to be true. We know, of course, that profits before taxes have dropped precipitously. But with the lower tax rates which became effective in 1954, profits which may be retained by business will probably compare not too unfavorably with retained profits in the previous year. And as we know, during the first year of the new administration, business profits as a whole continued about the same as in 1952, the last year of a Democratic administration.

According to reports compiled by the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Trade Commission, profits of manufacturing corporations before taxes were at an annual rate of 22.1 percent in 1952; 22.6 percent in 1953; and 19.2 percent in the first half of 1954. Thus, before taxes the profit rate in the first half of 1954 was 15.8 percent lower than in the first half of 1952.

If we compare the rates after taxes, however, we find that for all manufacturing corporations combined, the rate in the first half of 1954 was only 2 percent less than in the first half of 1952. More specifically, manufacturers' profits after taxes were at an annual rate of 10.1 percent in the first half of 1952; 11 percent in the first half of 1953; and 9.9 percent in the first half of 1954. Both official and unofficial reports agree that the business recession which was in evidence in the first half of 1954 continued into the third quarter of that year, and that thereafter there was a substantial recovery in the fourth quarter. Today, there is a note of business optimism—at least in some quarters. The administration predicts a great expansion of business capacity and pins our economic future on that prediction. There is a wave of mergers taking place, in which big firms are buying up small firms of all kinds. And there is a speculative boom in the stock market.

In view of all this activity and this official optimism, we may reasonably ask then, Is there any legitimate basis for all complaints from small business? Why are small firms so generally pessimistic and why are so many of them folding up and selling their plants to their larger competitors? The answer is not hard to find; we need only to look behind these figures on overall profits to find that the very biggest corporations have substantially increased their profits; that profits of corporations of lesser sizes have dropped; and in the case of the smaller ones, they have dropped to a comparative nothing.

In the first half of 1952, the last year of a Democratic administration, the smallest size group of manufacturers—those firms having total assets of less than \$250,000—had a profit rate which was almost on a parity with the profit rate of the very largest size group—those firms having assets of more than \$100 million. More specifically, profits of the smallest size group were at an annual rate of 10.6 percent, after taxes, while profits of the giants were at an annual rate of 11.3 percent, after taxes. But in the first half of last year, 1954, the after-taxes profit rate of the smallest size group had dropped to 4.1 percent, a drop of 61.4 percent. The profit rate of the giants, on the other hand, had risen to 12.0 percent, or an increase of 6.1.

These figures should shake every man in this Chamber out of his seat. For they will surely shake the foundations of our Nation unless something is done to correct them and to correct the causes which bring them about. Let me put it to each of you: What do you think the eventual effect will be when in the course of 2 short years the profit rate after taxes drops 61.4 percent for the smallest manufacturers and increases 6 percent for the biggest manufacturers?

What about the size groups in between? The answer is as a general, but not unvarying, rule that the smaller the corporation, the lower the profit rate after taxes. And also as a general, but not unvarying, rule, the smaller the corporation, the bigger the decrease in its profit rate between the first half of 1952 and the first half of 1954. The profit

rates, on an annual basis, after taxes were as follows:

Corporations with total assets of:	Profit rate Percent
Under \$250 thousand.....	4.1
\$250 thousand to \$1 million.....	6.4
\$1 to \$5 million.....	5.7
\$5 to \$10 million.....	7.6
\$10 to \$50 million.....	8.7
\$50 to \$100 million.....	8.6
Over \$100 million.....	12.0
All sizes.....	9.9

Similarly, the changes in profit rates, after taxes, between the first half of 1952 and the first half of 1954 were as follows:

Corporations with total assets of:	Change in profit rate Percent
Less than \$250 thousand.....	-61.4
\$250 thousand to \$1 million.....	-28.8
\$1 million to \$5 million.....	-28.8
\$5 to \$10 million.....	-10.6
\$10 to \$50 million.....	-8.5
\$50 to \$100 million.....	-9.5
Over \$100 million.....	+6.1
All sizes.....	-2.0

The profit rates we have been discussing are computed as percentages of what is called the stockholders' equity. Stockholders' equity is paid in capital, plus earned surplus, and thus it includes all investment in the corporation except borrowed capital. But whether we look at profits on stockholders' equity or profits per dollar of sales, we find the same results—except that in the latter case we find in the picture an even greater disparity between large and small corporations. In the first half of 1954, profits per dollar of sales, after taxes, for the biggest corporations was more than six times the rate for the smallest-size group. And the rate for the smallest-size group had dropped 60.9 percent from the first half of 1952, while the rate for the giants had risen by 10.5 percent.

Profit rates per dollar of sales for each size group, together with the change in rate from the first half of 1952, were as follows—this is after taxes:

Corporations with total assets of—	Profit per dollar of sales Cents	Change in profit rate from 1st half of 1952
Less than \$¼ million.....	0.9	-60.9
\$¼ to \$1 million.....	1.9	-17.4
\$1 to \$5 million.....	2.1	-19.3
\$5 to \$10 million.....	3.4	-2.9
\$10 to \$50 million.....	4.0	0
\$50 to \$100 million.....	4.0	-2.5
Over \$100 million.....	6.3	+10.5
All sizes.....	4.5	+7.1

Thus in the manufacturing fields at least, we find that instead of a general expansion of business, the giant corporations are becoming more profitable and growing, while the smaller corporations are becoming less profitable, drying up, and selling out. As for firms in other lines of business, the distribution and service trades, we have no authoritative profits reports. I know, however, of no difference in the economic forces playing

upon these trades, or in the Government-made forces affecting these trades, with this one exception: Profits of manufacturers are much more affected by the way Federal procurement contracts are distributed than are profits in other fields, since most of the Federal procurement is from manufacturers. At least I would expect that the shift has not been quite so great in the non-manufacturing fields as it has been in the manufacturing fields. It should be remembered, however, that these firms whose profits have been reported are not engaged in manufacturing exclusively. Many, if not most of these, perform also some distribution and service functions. Many have their own wholesale and even retail and service outlets. They are classified as manufacturers merely because the principal phase of their business is manufacturing and, moreover, the profits from all phases of their business are included in the figures we have considered. Hence, we may expect that the profits shift from small to large firms among these companies will not be greatly unlike the experience of all companies.

What then is the answer to this problem? Surely it is not to sit idly by and allow all business activity in this country to come under the control of a few corporate empires. Surely we cannot expect to have an expansion of business, nor even maintain a stable level of business, when all business has become a privileged monopoly and opportunity for independent business has disappeared.

Actually, the answer or answers to this question will depend upon a fuller exploration and understanding of the problem. And I have no doubt there are many problems of a complex and inter-related character. I have said that the answer to small business complaints and to the general pessimism of small business is easy to find—that it lies in this profits picture. But the profits picture is merely the end result of unknown, and perhaps many, underlying problems. These may not be so easy to isolate and appraise. It will, however, be the unvarying purpose of our committee to explore these problems and to make the facts and appraisals known, so that when the House acts upon matters affecting small business, it may act with informed judgment.

Annual rates of profits (as percent of stockholders' equity) of manufacturing corporations, by size of corporation

BEFORE TAXES				
	1st half of 1952	1st half of 1953	1st half of 1954	Change 1952 to 1954
Corporations with total assets of—				
Less than \$¼ million.....	18.0	17.5	8.1	-55.0
\$¼ to \$1 million.....	18.5	19.6	13.2	-28.7
\$1 to \$5 million.....	20.5	20.7	13.3	-35.2
\$5 to \$10 million.....	21.8	26.4	17.3	-20.7
\$10 to \$50 million.....	23.4	25.4	18.1	-22.7
\$50 to \$100 million.....	22.3	24.6	17.7	-20.7
Over \$100 million.....	24.2	27.9	22.1	-8.7
All asset sizes.....	22.8	25.7	19.2	-15.8

Annual rates of profits (as percent of stockholders' equity) of manufacturing corporations, by size of corporation—Continued

AFTER TAXES				
	1st half of 1952	1st half of 1953	1st half of 1954	Change 1952 to 1954
Corporations with total assets of—				
Less than \$¼ million.....	10.6	10.1	4.1	-61.4
\$¼ to \$1 million.....	7.8	9.1	6.4	-18.0
\$1 million to \$5 million.....	8.0	8.9	5.7	-28.8
\$5 to \$10 million.....	8.5	10.6	7.6	-10.6
\$10 to \$50 million.....	9.5	10.6	8.7	-8.5
\$50 to \$100 million.....	9.5	10.0	8.6	-9.5
Over \$100 million.....	11.3	12.0	12.0	+6.1
All asset sizes.....	10.1	11.0	9.9	-2.0

Profits per dollar of sales of manufacturing corporations, by size of corporation

BEFORE TAXES				
	1st half of 1952	1st half of 1953	1st half of 1954	Change 1952 to 1954
Corporations with total assets of—				
Less than \$¼ million.....	3.9	3.9	1.9	-51.3
\$¼ to \$1 million.....	5.5	5.3	4.0	-27.3
\$1 to \$5 million.....	6.8	6.9	4.9	-28.0
\$5 to \$10 million.....	8.9	9.9	7.6	-14.7
\$10 to \$50 million.....	9.9	10.3	8.3	-16.2
\$50 to \$100 million.....	9.7	10.1	8.2	-15.5
Over \$100 million.....	12.4	12.8	11.5	-7.3
All asset sizes.....	9.6	10.2	8.7	-9.4

AFTER TAXES				
	1st half of 1952	1st half of 1953	1st half of 1954	Change 1952 to 1954
Corporations with total assets of—				
Less than \$¼ million.....	2.3	2.3	0.9	-60.9
\$¼ to \$1 million.....	2.3	2.5	1.9	-17.4
\$1 to \$5 million.....	2.6	3.0	2.1	-19.3
\$5 to \$10 million.....	3.5	3.9	3.4	-2.9
\$10 to \$50 million.....	4.0	4.3	4.0	0
\$50 to \$100 million.....	4.1	4.1	4.0	-2.5
Over \$100 million.....	5.7	5.5	6.3	+10.5
All asset sizes.....	4.2	4.4	4.5	+7.1

Annual rates of profits (as percent of stockholders' equity) of manufacturing corporations, by size of corporation

BEFORE TAXES			
	Full year 1952	Full year 1953	1st half 1954
Corporations with total assets of—			
Less than \$¼ million.....	17.0	12.4	8.1
\$¼ to \$1 million.....	16.7	15.6	13.2
\$1 to \$5 million.....	19.6	17.4	13.3
\$5 to \$10 million.....	21.2	22.3	17.3
\$10 to \$50 million.....	22.8	22.5	18.1
\$50 to \$100 million.....	21.9	21.8	17.7
Over \$100 million.....	23.6	25.1	22.1
All asset sizes.....	22.1	22.6	19.2

AFTER TAXES			
	Full year 1952	Full year 1953	1st half 1954
Corporations with total assets of—			
Less than \$¼ million.....	9.3	6.8	4.1
\$¼ to \$1 million.....	7.2	7.1	6.4
\$1 to \$5 million.....	8.0	7.5	5.7
\$5 to \$10 million.....	8.8	9.2	7.6
\$10 to \$50 million.....	9.7	9.9	8.7
\$50 to \$100 million.....	9.9	9.4	8.6
Over \$100 million.....	11.8	12.1	12.0
All asset sizes.....	10.3	10.5	9.9

RESOLUTION TO CREATE SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE

I have introduced the following resolution. The chairman of the Committee

tee on Rules, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, has promised consideration as soon as the Committee on Rules is set up or as soon thereafter as convenient for the chairman and the committee.

It is as follows:

House Resolution 55

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1955, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 12 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 7 from the majority party and 5 from the minority party, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering the optimum operation of established small business and/or its development and enterprise; (2) whether agencies, departments of the Government, or Government-owned or controlled corporations are properly, adequately, or equitably serving the needs of small business; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of strategic and other materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sale, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the solution of the problems of small business during the continuance of the existing national emergency.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CI—17

FEDERAL COURT BACKLOG

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include two articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, there have recently appeared in the Washington newspapers some very illuminating articles concerning the condition of the United States courts. These articles point up the fact that we have been derelict in our duty to see to it that the machinery of justice is kept in order. I insert these two articles in the hope that the membership generally will examine them and cooperate to the end that justice may be done to all of the people who go into our courts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am anxious to associate myself with the gentleman from Pennsylvania with reference to these articles. I have read them, and I think they are well worth reading by all of the Members. I have talked with the gentleman about this matter before, and hope that this approach which is suggested in those articles can be made a bipartisan approach and that we will be able to work out a constructive method whereby the Chief Justice of the United States may be permitted to address the Houses of the Congress.

Mr. WALTER. I am not so certain that the proper way to make the country cognizant of the seriousness of the situation is by having the Chief Justice address a joint session of the Congress. It may well be that a communication from him to the appropriate committee of the Congress would be sufficient. However, these articles do point up the gravity of the situation.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 9, 1955]

SUPPORT GROWING FOR REPORT TO CONGRESS BY CHIEF JUSTICE—CAPITOL ADDRESS VIEWED AS DRAMATIC WAY TO INFORM PEOPLE OF COURTS' PROBLEMS

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Congress will be asked to make history this session by inviting the Chief Justice of the United States to address the Congress on the state of the judiciary.

The unprecedented proposal, first advanced publicly in November, is gaining wide support from judges, lawyers, and legislators.

Such an invitation would require action by both Houses. A survey by the Star indicates that legislators most familiar with the problems of the courts favor the invitation.

These legislators reason that the people have a right to know the condition of their third branch of Government as described by its chief.

They feel that an informed Congress would take steps to remedy some of the conditions that create delay and inefficiency in the administration of justice. The searchlight of public opinion trained on the courts could remedy others.

These are some of the conditions likely to be publicly aired if Chief Justice Warren addresses the Congress:

The Federal courts are seriously handicapped by insufficient funds, insufficient judges, and delays in appointing new judges.

These handicaps are reflected in some parts of the country by time lags of up to 45 months in getting cases tried. Justice so delayed often means justice denied.

While the vast majority of the Federal judges devote full time to the bench, there are others who from illness, age, or indifference fail to carry their share of the load.

The refusal of some courts to adopt such modern methods as pretrial procedures has prevented these courts from cutting down their backlog of cases.

On the other hand, delays in trying cases have given ammunition to those who would short-cut justice and eliminate jury trials by establishing commissions and arbiters to hear cases.

The Federal courts now have jurisdiction over some types of cases that might well be transferred to the State courts.

Some of the Federal judiciary districts are set up so unrealistically as far as population and case loads are concerned that one court will stand idle while a court in a neighboring district is far behind in its work because of an enormous case load.

The Judicial Conference of the United States, which sets up the requested budget for the courts, tends to be overconservative in its requests for funds and for more judges.

The Federal courts, up to 1939, had a powerful spokesman—the Attorney General. Then, because the Justice Department was the chief litigant before the courts and because it was thought preferable to make the judiciary branch financially independent of the executive branch, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts was established.

The courts now have a separate budget which cannot be touched by the Budget Bureau. Now, only Congress can cut the court budget. The Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts, usually accompanied by one or more judges, appears before Appropriations Subcommittees.

Obviously, their message is not getting across. The budget was cut by a million dollars for this year. The funds to finance the Federal courts comprise one twenty-fifth of 1 percent of the total appropriation to operate the Government during the current fiscal year.

The Judicial Conference of the United States—the Chief Justice and the chief judges of the circuits—recommends legislation and additional judgeships as well as budget needs. Its reports go to Congress, as do the annual reports of the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts. But busy legislators can't be expected to read all the volumes that cross their desks.

For some time, members of the bench and bar have been saying privately that something should be done to arouse public concern over delayed justice. In November, Deputy Attorney General William P. Rogers proposed in a speech at Cleveland that the most effective way to focus public attention on the judiciary was through an address to Congress by the Chief Justice of the United States.

LETTERS COMMEND PLAN

After the speech, scores of approving letters reached him from judges and lawyers throughout the country.

"Without doubt," wrote one judge, "the efficiency of the courts is being seriously impaired by the failure of Congress to provide sufficient funds for the efficient operations of the courts."

A west coast judge cited the absurd situation in a Southwestern State where a judge, already ill when he was confirmed, has spent 5 hours in court in the past 4 years.

A midwestern judge reported that his court was fairly current with its calendar of cases because he and his colleague took no extended vacations—despite the fact that for 75 days between June and September 30 the

temperature fluctuated between 100 and 111. The court was not air-conditioned. In some other courts, the judges make no effort to hold court during the summer because the courtrooms are stifling—and the backlog of cases continues to grow.

PENNY-PINCHING IMPAIRS JUSTICE

A judge whose district covers a wide territory wrote: "Any conscientious judge hesitates to dispose of a criminal case without a full report of the probation officer and often these reports cannot be obtained without great delay simply because of the lack of travel funds."

Mr. Rogers also heard from a judge who wrote: "The failure to supply the judges with the necessary libraries often results in injustice to litigants."

The Deputy Attorney General emphasized in his speech that he believed the problem was not wholly budgetary and that many of the court's ills could be corrected if the whole Congress and the people knew about them.

TENDENCY TO LOAF

Explaining his position further to the Star, he said:

Federal judgeships are lifetime appointments and they are subject to no supervision. Although the great majority of Federal judges work hard, some take advantage of their lifetime tenure with long vacations and short hours on the bench. There is, for instance, one district with a tremendous backlog of cases where two of the judges haven't tried a case in more than 2 years and a third sits only occasionally.

"An annual or biennial address to Congress by the Chief Justice would focus public attention on the areas of the country where the calendar is up to date and those where the calendar is far behind.

"Then, local publicity would lead to finding out what the causes of delays are in each district and what can be done to correct them. By calling attention to the problems, much support also would be generated for necessary legislation.

"The judiciary has set up a very intelligent system for deciding what its needs are. The only trouble is that its recommendations never come to public notice. At present, the only people who know the inadequacies of the system are those who go into court as litigants. Then they find out how long they have to wait for their cases to be tried.

"It is obvious that delays of 3 or 4 years in the trial of a case can result in great injustice both to plaintiffs and defendants.

"Where people have to wait years to have their cases tried—for whatever reason—justice is in default."

COURT DELAY COSTS GOVERNMENT \$3 MILLION A YEAR, OFFICIAL SAYS—EXPENSE IS CITED AS SUPPORTING PROPOSAL FOR REPORT BY CHIEF JUSTICE TO CONGRESS

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Delays in getting cases to trial in Federal courts are costing the Government at least \$3 million a year, a Justice Department spokesman reported today.

This needless expense is one of the reasons why Justice Department officials are supporting the move to invite the Chief Justice of the United States to address the Congress on the state of the judiciary.

Federal court delays—ranging up to 45 months—cost the Government approximately \$2.5 million in interest payments on civil suits alone, according to the Justice Department.

The costs run over \$3 million with interest payments on Indian claims and contested tax refunds, as well as the expense of locating witnesses.

"When a case has been pending for years," the Justice official explained, "witnesses disappear. Deputy marshals have to cover

many miles to locate them and then the traveling expenses of the witnesses must be paid. Also, when a case is stale, the expert witnesses may have to spend 2 weeks going over material which they could have covered in 1 day when the case was fresh. And these experts have to be paid \$50 to \$100 a day.

Delays in the disposition of cases also hit hard at the private individual who takes his case into a Federal court. If he sues, he may lose his property while he's waiting to collect. If he is defending and his cause is just, he suffers interference with his business and personal affairs during the waiting period.

For both the Government and the private litigant, legal observers point out, delays in getting cases to trial can mean that key witnesses forget the facts or they cannot be located when the case finally comes to trial. That is what is meant when attorneys and judges say justice delayed is often justice denied.

If the Chief Justice is invited to address the Congress on the state of the judiciary, these delays—and what can be done about them—presumably would figure importantly in his report.

RECENT STUDY CITED

A recent study of the time consumed from the filing of a case to its disposition in the Federal courts and the backlog of cases in these courts shows:

During the year ending July 1, 1954, United States district courts disposed of 93,161 cases but left pending an additional 78,531.

This backlog has accumulated over years but in recent years has increased at a swifter rate.

During the past 3 years the backlog of criminal cases increased 31 percent and the backlog of civil cases 23 percent.

On the basis of last year's rate of disposing of cases it would take all the district court judges 10 months merely to eliminate the backlog without touching the current business.

In theory, the courts should try to dispose of cases within 6 months after they are filed. But a cross section of district courts showed 13.5 months elapsed from the time a suit was filed until its disposition during the past fiscal year. In these courts it took 8.1 months from calendaring to trial.

DELAY IN NEW YORK

Some courts were in far worse shape. In the southern district of New York, which encompasses New York City, the litigant could expect to wait 35.9 months for his civil case to get to trial after calendaring and 45 months from the time he filed suit until the case was decided.

In the eastern district of New York, located in Brooklyn, the usual time from filing suit to disposition was 39.5 months.

In the District of Columbia it took an average of 23 months after the case was ready for trial to get to trial in a civil jury case last year. In the eastern district of Pennsylvania, which includes Philadelphia, the interval from filing suit to disposition was 24.7 months. In the eastern district of Michigan, which includes Detroit, the interval from filing to disposition was 16.9 months.

In the northern district of Illinois, which includes Chicago, the interval from filing to disposition was 15.1 months, in the district of New Jersey it was 19.2 months, and in the district of Nebraska 15.6 months.

If the case is appealed, the litigant faces more delays. For the 11 United States courts of appeals the normal time from filing of the complete record in the appellate court to final disposition of civil cases was 7.1 months during the last fiscal year. The time

from filing the complaint in the lower court to decision in the court of appeals was 21.4 months.

REASONS ANALYZED

What causes these delays in the disposition of cases? Some observers cite the judges who fail to carry their fair share of the load, scorn modern time-saving methods or take long summer vacations. Court figures show, however, that more cases were disposed of per judge last year than in any year since 1947 and the total disposition of cases was the highest since 1933.

But justice still is delayed. These factors are cited:

1. The increase in the number of judges has failed to match the increase in the case load. In 1900, the case load per judge was 236. In 1954, the case load per judge was 403.

While the number of cases increased four-fold, the number of judgeships was a little more than doubled. If the increase in judgeships had been commensurate with the increase in case load, there would presently be 404 district court judgeships, rather than 251.

APPELLATE COURT SHORTAGE

In the courts of appeals, too, the case load outdistanced the judges. In 1900, there were 29 appellate judges with a case load of 38 per judge. In 1954, there were 68 appellate judges with a case load of 51 each. If the number of judges had increased as fast as the case load, there would now be 87 appellate judgeships rather than 68.

2. The overconservatism of the Judicial Conference of the United States in recommending new judgeships. This group of judges has recommended judgeships only after the case load has begun to overwhelm rather than at the first sign of trouble.

3. Delays in getting the new judgeships once they are recommended. Since 1945, Congress has created 63, of which 57 were recommended by the Judicial Conference. But of those 57, only 6 were created during the year in which the recommendation was made; 23 not until the following year, 9 not until 2 years later, 12 not until 3 years later, 4 not until 4 years later, and 3 not until 5 years later.

There are delays in creating the judgeships, delays in selecting the appointees and sometimes delays in confirmation.

Thus, by the time the judge takes his place on the bench, the caseload which prompted the recommendation for the new judgeship has mounted to the point where another judge is needed.

BUDGETS REDUCED

4. Annual cuts in the budget for the Federal courts. Typical of the crippling cuts in the 1955 budget was the provision of staff salaries for only 15 new judges although 30 new judgeships were created.

The million-dollar cut in the budget for this fiscal year prompted the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to notify the judges to:

Avoid temporary extra help such as those necessary to meet peak workloads.

Make no appointments of personnel until leave payments of the former employee had expired.

Avoid employing substitutes for regular employees ill or on vacation.

Travel funds were cut. So were funds for legal publications.

The cuts hit at courts already understaffed in the clerks and probation offices. With a high rate of turnover in the clerks' offices because of low salaries, inexperienced help must handle vital legal papers. With too few probation officers, sentencing is sometimes delayed for a month or more to await presentence investigations. Probationers in need of much attention to keep

from sliding back into crime may get no more than an hour's help a month from their probation officers.

Legislators, attorneys, and judges backing the move to have the Chief Justice address the Congress believe these facts should be made known to all the legislators and to the people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LeCOMPTRE and include a statement of counterpart funds used by committees in Europe during the past year.

Mr. BENTLEY and include a speech, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to exceed the limit and is estimated to cost \$200.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. BEAMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL and include a report from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. SADLAK and to include a brief resolution.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include an editorial appearing in today's Washington Post and Times-Herald.

Mr. RODINO in three instances.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. PRICE) in three instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 13, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

239. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the 27th annual report of the work and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved May 7, 1928, as amended (22 U. S. C. 278) (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

240. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on co-operation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of November 1954, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

241. A letter from the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1954, pursuant to the act of Congress approved September 26, 1888; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2000. A bill to state explicitly the long standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and to provide means of implementing that policy more effectively; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 2001. A bill to provide hospital care for certain veterans residing in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 2002. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2003. A bill to amend section 402 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to eliminate discrimination against certain personnel of the uniformed services incapacitated prior to physical examination for promotion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 2004. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 1 year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 2005. A bill to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 2006. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2007. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2008. A bill to provide for a heliport in the District of Columbia, for use in helicopter service between the Friendship International Airport and the downtown area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2009. A bill to authorize a program for the construction of county agricultural buildings, through assistance in planning and financing such projects in counties where agriculture is a predominant industry, thereby providing centralized housing and facilities for Federal, State, and local offices engaged in administering agricultural and related programs concerned with the welfare of the farm population; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2010. A bill to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 2011. A bill to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 2012. A bill to amend section 6 (a) of Public Law 377 of the act of May 13, 1946, entitled "An act to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports," as amended by Public Law 382 of October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 903); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2013. A bill to amend section 302, title III, of the act of June 23, 1947, known as the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (61 Stat. 157; 29 U. S. C. 186); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 2014. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 2015. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 2016. A bill to provide for income-tax purposes a deduction with respect to the amortization of devices for the collection of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

H. R. 2017. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2018. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote export trade, and for other purposes," approved April 10, 1918, to provide that no export trade association shall restrict any foreign buyer from dealing, directly or through an agent of his own selection, with any producer, manufacturer, or seller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2019. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation the interest received from loans guaranteed under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2021. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the finality of determinations relating to the assessment of duties or charges on certain imported merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2022. A bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2023. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to review de novo claims for benefits and payments under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2024. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes to be made to local taxing authorities with respect to Federal real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. R. 2025. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2026. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2027. A bill to state explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm pattern of American agriculture, and to provide means of implementing that policy more effectively; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2028. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2029. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), to include persons whose service-connected disability is rated not less than 10 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 2030. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on the Mississippi River for the protection of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 2031. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2032. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2033. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to increase the maximum and minimum rates at which disability compensation may be paid thereafter; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2034. A bill to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2035. A bill to provide for the crediting of certain service toward retirement of Reserve personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2036. A bill to provide for the tonnage composition of the United States Navy with respect to vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 2037. A bill to authorize the improvement of the Sammamish River, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2038. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least \$100 per month to all American citizens 65 years of age and over who have been citizens 10 years or more, to be prorated according to the cost of living as on January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 83. Resolution opposing the seating of Communist China in organs of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2040. A bill for the relief of the F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 2041. A bill for the relief of Damiano Mario Carmine Palusci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 2042. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Schober Frugia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 2043. A bill for the relief of Nathaniel Ross Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 2044. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Monchen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2045. A bill for the relief of Joe Baragas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2046. A bill for the relief of Robert O. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (by request):

H. R. 2047. A bill for the relief of Isaac Sclaky and Isabella Sclaky (also known as Isaac Siaki and Isabella Siaki); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2048. A bill for the relief of Charles S. Stutzer and Halya Stutzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2049. A bill for the relief of Anastasios Selemetzidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2050. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norman Rowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2051. A bill for the relief of Dustean Alexander Youngs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2052. A bill for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2053. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Shikany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2054. A bill for the relief of Induk Pakh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2055. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Niniema (Taha) Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2056. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Soumplis (also known as Tom Makres) to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2057. A bill for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 2058. A bill for the relief of Dr. Domingo Abella, Mrs. Maria Liado Abella, Eva Abella, Laura Abella, Ernesto Abella, and Elizabeth Abella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2059. A bill for the relief of Edward Patrick Cloonan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2060. A bill for the relief of Erna Oprischko Speciale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2061. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nellie White Houck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 2062. A bill for the relief of Delmara Jerucia Roper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 2063. A bill for the relief of MacArthur Mining Co., Inc., in receivership; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 2064. A bill for the relief of Paul Joseph Spilingaard, Helen Colette Spilingaard, and Renee Anne Spilingaard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2065. A bill for the relief of Sada Zarikian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 2066. A bill for the relief of Spyragelos Vagelatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2067. A bill for the relief of Georgios Vagelatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 2068. A bill for the relief of William F. Friedman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2069. A bill for the relief of Cornelius A. Frouin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of Dr. Carlos Recio and his wife, Francisca Marco Palomero de Recio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2071. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Celeste Hall Oliver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2072. A bill for the relief of Julian Nowakowski, or William Nowak (Novak); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2073. A bill for the relief of Bengt Wikstam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 2074. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marianne Ptak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2075. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. R. 2076. A bill for the relief of Victoria Clita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 2077. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carreri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2078. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cannizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2079. A bill for the relief of Ingrid Liselette Poch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2080. A bill for the relief of Ertugrul Igin and Mrs. Nukhet Igin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2081. A bill for the relief of Joseph Antony Russ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (by request):

H. R. 2082. A bill for the relief of Rosa Maria C. Tiampo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2083. A bill for the relief of Walter Oppenheim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 2084. A bill for the relief of Gerassimos V. Palmos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2085. A bill to refer to the United States Court of Claims H. R. 1485, a bill for the relief of William E. Nash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2086. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Fritz Liermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Erika Rambauske; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 2088. A bill for the relief of Swami Shivananda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred Fletcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2039. A bill for the relief of Agostino Gentile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statement of Counterpart Funds Charged
to Committees of the House of Repre-
sentatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1954, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement with reference to the history and use of counterpart funds by Members of the House of Representatives who had traveled abroad on official committee business. I also inserted in the RECORD at that time a preliminary report received from the Secretary of State listing the names of the countries in which counterpart funds were available, together with a series of tables showing the amount of counterpart funds expended by members of committees of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1954 insofar as information was available at that time.

On January 3, 1955, as chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I received from Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton a statement based on reports to the Department of State by United States disbursing officers abroad, giving the total net amounts of counterpart funds drawn by committees of the House of Representatives from July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954, expressed in United States dollar equivalents. While it is believed that most of the obligations incurred by committees which traveled during the fiscal year 1954 were liquidated during fiscal year 1954, and are reflected in this statement, it is possible that additional payments have been or will be made on behalf of these groups during the current fiscal year 1955, and have not as yet been reported to the State Department. Any such payments will be included in the fiscal year 1955 reports and designated as payments against 1954 travel. The statement furnished by the Department of State follows:

Statement of counterpart fund charges to committees of the House of Representatives, July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954
[Expressed in United States dollar equivalent values]

Total net charges:	
House Appropriations Committee	\$48,914.29
House Armed Services Committee	14,713.28
House Committee on Foreign Affairs	19,965.34
House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce	20,265.70
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs	1,020.18
House Committee on the Judiciary	52,587.61
Grand total of net charges	157,466.40

Public Law 665, 83d Congress, provides that any committee of the House of Representatives which uses counterpart funds shall make a full report thereof to the Committee on House Administration, showing the total amount of such currency so used in each country and the purposes for which it was expended.

Revision of the McCarran Immigration
Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today an immigration and naturalization bill to revise our present immigration laws. The title of my bill is "Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955," and it is intended to replace the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

Let me state at the very outset that the chief objection to the McCarran-Walter Act is that it is based on the national-supremacy doctrine which maintains that the people of some nations were superior to others. According to the McCarran-Walter Act, this idea is reflected in our present immigration policy. Needless to say, it is a fallacious theory because there is no such thing as a superior race or a superior people. A law reflecting such outmoded ideas has no place on our statute books and should be removed as soon as possible. We need an immigration law that will conform with American concepts of justice, fair play, and basic traditions.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a cosmopolitan district in the city of New York. The people of our great city are for the most part of immigrant stock. They are either immigrants themselves or children and grandchildren of immigrants. Their roots are solidly planted in this country. They are intensely loyal and patriotic citizens of the United States. It is because they have known the adversities of life abroad at firsthand that they can best appreciate the American way of life.

They and many millions of others throughout our country are intensely interested in the problem of immigration and are anxious for the United States to follow a liberal policy in the matter. I recall that during my service in the 82d Congress I had been approached by numerous people to help them in their immigration matters. Some of these were very tragic cases: Parents who wanted to be united with their children; broken families because the husband or the wife could not come here; deportation of the husband which left an entire family without support, and similar other cases. I did my utmost to help these people in every possible way.

Unfortunately, our immigration laws in recent years have been rather harsh, discriminatory, and often inhumane. The McCarran-Walter Act was intended to be a codification of all previous immigration and naturalization laws, but actually turned out to be a codification of all the discriminations and the prejudices against immigrants thought up during the past few decades. I am referring particularly to the quota system, the method of selecting immigrants who seek entry to this country, which dates back to the early 1920's when it was first enacted in an atmosphere of isolationism and hatred of all foreigners.

Under the quota system a total of 154,000 immigrants may be admitted annually to the United States. The original law enacted in 1921 set up the quotas on the basis of the 1910 census. It also contained the obnoxious implication that the people of southern and eastern Europe are inferior to those of northern and western Europe. In 1924, the law was amended and made even more discriminating against those of southern and eastern European origin. Quotas were reduced from 3 to 2 percent, and the census basis was moved back from 1910 to 1890, the reason being that immigration from southern and eastern Europe had hardly begun by 1890. Naturally, the quotas for those countries were drastically reduced. Thus, Italy's quota was cut from 42,000 under the 1921 law to less than 6,000 under the 1924 amendments; Poland's quota was reduced from 31,000 to 6,500, and the same was true for other countries.

Mr. Speaker, when a codification of our immigration laws was undertaken several years ago, million of our citizens had hoped that the biased and intolerant laws would be eliminated and a new approach toward the selection of immigrants would be established, but those who drew up the McCarran-Walter bill included the worst and most obnoxious features which had accumulated on our statute books over the past 30 years. The restrictive quota system was retained, large quotas were again assigned to countries unable to use them up, and the unused portions of the quotas were wasted instead of permitting low-quota countries to use them.

So much for the quota system. Now, let us examine briefly another set of regulations in the McCarran-Walter Act which constitute an insult to all Americans who believe in the concept of equality. I mean the provisions which deal with naturalized citizens. Under the McCarran-Walter Act it is easier to deprive such people of their citizenship and deport them from the United States. In the past it was necessary to provide proof of fraud at the time of naturalization, but now it merely needs to be shown that a person failed to mention some minor incident in his past and he stands to lose his citizenship. It is a threat which hangs over his head for the rest of his life. This, in effect, sets up two classes

of citizenship, since no naturalized citizen can ever feel secure of his citizenship status any more; it is something which we have never before had since this Republic has been founded.

There are many other injustices in that act, perhaps too numerous to mention. Suffice it to mention the findings of a Presidential commission, named by President Truman in 1952 to study the act. In January 1953 this commission reported its findings of the McCarran-Walter Act as follows:

First. It discriminates against human beings on account of their national origin, their religious belief, and their color.

Second. It is based on hatred and distrust of all aliens.

Third. It ignores the needs of the United States in domestic affairs and foreign policy.

Fourth. It contains unnecessary and unreasonable restrictions and penalties against individuals.

Fifth. It is badly drafted, confusing, and in some respects unworkable.

In the 2 years since the Eisenhower administration is in power and in the 83d Congress nothing was done to wipe out the inequities of the McCarran-Walter Act and to restore sanity and dignity to our immigration system. The President has made no effort to keep his 1952 campaign pledge to support legislation to revise the McCarran-Walter Act. The 83d Congress, likewise, made no attempt to amend the act, but adopted the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to admit 214,000 European refugees over a 3-year period. By now, many of us are aware that this act turned out to be a hoax, since its many restrictions make it so unworkable that only about 10,000 persons have been admitted under this law which went into effect on August 7, 1953. This is a separate issue to which I hope to return in the very near future with some constructive suggestions.

Many of my colleagues, I am sure, will recall that I was strenuously opposed to the McCarran-Walter measure when it came before the House in 1952, and then when President Truman vetoed it I voted to uphold the President's veto. Since then I have followed all developments in connection with this act; I have sought means and ways of revising it, and I have given the matter much thought and study.

Here are some of the major changes recommended in my bill:

First. The so-called national origins quota system is abolished as a basis for admission and in its place is proposed a unified quota system to be comprised of three groups of eligible immigrants:

A. Those coming under the family unification preference, but not more than one-third of the quota numbers are to be allocated for this purpose;

B. Those coming under occupational preference, which is to be limited to 10 percent;

C. The remainder shall be allotted to newcomers, including those seeking religious or political asylum, and those needed here in the national interest.

Second. There is to be no discrimination against any person seeking to enter

this country as an immigrant, because of national origin, religion, race, or color.

Third. The number of annual quota visas is to be established on the basis of one-sixth of 1 percent of the United States population according to the 1940 census, the last prewar decennial census. On this basis a total of 220,000 immigrants may be admitted annually, which is about 75,000 more than under the present quota system. Furthermore, the allocation of quotas for all countries would be more equitable because the 1940 census is more representative of our population now than is the census of 1890.

Fourth. The allocation of visas to the above three groups and the quotas assigned to each nation shall be determined by an Immigration and Naturalization Commission, proposed in the bill, and with the approval of the President. The Commission is to operate as an independent agency, thus avoiding much of the confusion now existing.

Fifth. Unused quotas are to be pooled and distributed among those countries whose quota allotments had been used up. It will be of interest to note that since 1924 only about 40 percent of the quota numbers have been used, namely, 1,500,000 entered the United States under the quota system while 2,500,000 visa numbers remained unfilled and unused.

Sixth. Aliens shall not be deported if they were admitted before their 14th birthday, or have lived in the United States for 20 years or more. The bill also provides that no alien can be deported by reason of conduct which occurred more than 10 years prior to the institution of the deportation proceedings.

Seventh. Several provisions are contained in the bill which would permit an alien who is under a final order of deportation to seek judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act or the Declaratory Judgment Act. In this way it is hoped to eliminate the contradictory standards of justice applied to alien residents in this country and the severe penalties meted out for minor errors and infractions of the law.

Eighth. All distinctions and discriminations between native-born and naturalized American citizens are eliminated and equality of all citizens under the law is established. In a democracy such as ours there is no room for second-class citizenship nor is discrimination against the naturalized citizens to be tolerated. The grounds for deprivation of citizenship, whether acquired by birth or naturalization, are remedied.

There are numerous other changes and remedies suggested in the bill to improve our immigration laws, which I trust will be adopted at an early date so that the United States will be able to maintain its tradition as the haven of the oppressed and the asylum for the persecuted. Continuation of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act on our statute books is a blot on the good name of our country. If we permit this discriminatory measure to remain unaltered and unrevised, then much which is precious to American ideals and traditions is destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the McCarran Act is not a true reflection of the thinking and the spirit in this country, or that it represents American opinion concerning the immigrant. The McCarran Act is not the proper law for a nation which has been settled and developed by immigrants throughout its history, and which has been built to its present greatness and world leadership with the help of immigrants.

For the sake of America's greatness, its international prestige, and its position of moral leadership among the nations of the world, I urge this Congress to take swift action to undo the wrongs of the McCarran-Walter Act and to adopt my proposed revision of it.

Social Security Benefits at Age 60

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today in this wonderfully productive country of ours, some 6 million people between the ages of 60 and 65 are being denied the right to social-security benefits on the arbitrary grounds that they cannot receive such benefits until their 65th birthday. Last year we made a number of revisions and improvements in the social-security system. But for some reason, which I fail to understand, no change was made in the eligibility age of 65 years which was adopted away back in 1935. Very simply, this restriction says to millions of Americans over age 60 who are physically unable to work—or who are unable to persuade any employer to hire them—that they must starve until they reach their 65th birthday.

I have long been concerned with this gross inequity in a system which is designed to provide at least a minimum of security for our senior citizens, and have introduced several bills which would right this inequity. Because I believe a lower eligibility age is the logical next step in improving our social-security system, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 703, which will pay benefits at age 60 instead of the present age 65.

Surely it is clear that no one can predict the precise day or year in which he will be completely disabled by a devastating illness. Neither can anyone predict that he or she will be able to continue in his job at least to a 65th birthday. Can there be any doubt in our minds that the need for retirement benefits varies greatly with individual circumstances? Some of us are able to work far beyond our 65th birthday. Others, through no fault of their own, are forced to retire from their job at much earlier ages. There is certainly no reality, then, to this idea that the need for retirement benefits begins only at age 65, and not before. Can we then, in equity, continue to perpetuate this antiquated idea that

the 65th birthday is the proper criterion as to eligibility for old-age benefits?

I have asked this question repeatedly—and the only answer I get is that such a liberalization of the system would cost money. For example, when an amendment which would have lowered the eligibility age to 60 years was introduced on the floor of the Senate during the last Congress we were told that the purpose of the amendment was laudable; that everyone hoped the retirement age could be reduced to age 60—but that it must be rejected because it would cost money.

Mr. Speaker, let us ask ourselves in all seriousness—what is the basic purpose of the social-security system? Is the major purpose of this program to provide a minimum of security for those of us who can no longer work because we are too old by the standards of our industrialized economy? Or is its major purpose to save money?

Now I recognize that no organized social-security system can be without some limitations. But I say to you that the crucial test with regard to such limitations should be chiefly concerned with the needs of our senior citizens as they change with the times. Let us be clear about the reasons why it is appropriate at this time to lower the eligibility age, because of changes in our economy. All studies show that a phenomena of America's industrial expansion is the fact that the average worklife has been shortened. For example, in 1890, about two-thirds of all men aged 65 and over were in the labor force. By 1950 this proportion had dropped to less than two-fifths. Even under the pressure of a wartime labor market in the 1940's, many employers were reluctant to take on older workers until supplies of younger men were exhausted.

The changes in the national economy which have added so remarkably to the total wealth of the country and to the improvements in our standard of living have also, then, had the net effect of restricting employment opportunities of older workers. The shift from a rural to a highly industrial economy is reflected in the long-term decline in farm employment and in the expansion of such occupations as semiskilled operators and clerical and sales workers. And these two expanding occupational fields use the lowest proportion of workers who are over age 45.

The problem of older workers in finding and holding jobs has been thoroughly documented in hundreds of careful studies and dozens of symposiums. Recently Ewan Clague, Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, summed up the situation in the following significant sentences:

Industrial change is proceeding at a rate faster than ever before in history—

He said.

The new process of automation (which substitutes machines and energy for manpower) is sure to bring about the decline and disappearance of many jobs and occupations. . . . Industries will naturally prefer younger people whom they can train and develop. Furthermore, the average business concern will have enough older people on its rolls

already, so that they will hesitate to hire any more.

Now, I agree with those people who are working to increase the job opportunities for older workers as one means of counteracting this trend. But let us not delude ourselves by believing that jobs for our senior citizens can ever provide any kind of a total solution. If we are realistic about it, I think we will all have to agree that it is only a piecemeal solution which will gradually benefit only those fortunate older people who are able to work, and are fortunate enough to find an employer who is willing to hire them.

For the majority of older people, who have been retired from their jobs because they are unable to work, increased job opportunities for the elderly are, of course, no solution at all. I am, then, here concerned with the elderly carpenter or machine-tool operator who is forced to retire from a lifelong job because he had a heart attack, or other ailment which makes it impossible for him to continue to work. I am concerned with women widowed at age 60, after a lifetime of making a home, who must, under our present system, wait 5 years until they are eligible for social-security benefits. I believe, further, that we must lower the eligibility age in order that we may increase job opportunities for younger workers.

I urge your support of my bill, H. R. 703 on the ground that it is a necessary revision of our social-security system to bring it in line with the dynamic economic conditions of today. I am convinced we must adjust that system to the changes in the average work life which I have described. But most of all, I believe we must lower the eligibility age by at least 5 years because, in so doing, we will be increasing the protection offered to those of our aged people who need it most—and that, as I understand it, is the major purpose of our social-security system.

Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress eight Republican and Democrat members of the Judiciary Subcommittee of the other body issued a unanimous report entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments." The document lifted the lid on over 20 years of Communist conspiracy inside our Government.

Inasmuch as there has been considerable wailing and weeping from certain quarters during the past few weeks relating to the conduct of the 1954 election campaign, I feel impelled to set before my colleagues a summary of the factual

record as it was disclosed officially and unaniously by these Democrat and Republican Members of the other body.

This report reveals that previous administrations were guilty of laxity, evasion, and obstinacy in dealing with the issue of communism in government. When read in light of recent political exaggerations expressed by Democratic Party leaders of GOP campaign language, it most positively dispels their complaint that the Democratic Party was charged with disloyalty.

Contrarily, it fully substantiates the laxity, evasion, and obstinacy allegations that were the sum and substance of GOP charges.

The report begins by describing the activities of the Soviet conspirators in the following language:

When the principal concern of the Government was economic recovery, they were in the AAA, the NRA, and new sections of old departments. During the war they joined such wartime agencies as the Board of Economic Warfare, the Foreign Economic Administration, the OSS, and the like. Toward the end of the war and in the postwar period, they were operating in the foreign policy field. At the end of the war they gravitated toward the international agencies.

Speaking of Government employees involved in the conspiracy, the report says:

They colonized key committees of Congress, helped write the laws, conducted congressional hearings, and wrote congressional reports.

They advised Cabinet members, wrote speeches for them, and represented them in Government conferences, staffed interdepartmental committees which prepared basic American and world policy.

They traveled to every continent as emissaries of the American people; attended virtually every international conference where statesmen met to shape the future, influenced the State Department with disastrous results.

There was an interlacing combination of these people in almost every agency which had to do with labor.

The Senators investigated how subversives got key Government posts and reported:

They used each other's names for references, hired each other, promoted each other, raised each other's salaries, transferred each other from bureau to bureau, department to department, assigned each other to international missions, vouched for each other's loyalty, protected each other when exposures were threatened.

The committee heard a former courier for the conspirators say:

We didn't have too much trouble (in moving agents). Two of our best (avenues for placing people in positions) were Harry Dexter White and Lauchlin Currie. Once we got one person in, he got others, and the whole process continued like that.

On the extent of this penetration into the United States Government, part of the report reads:

According to the evidence in our records, those involved in the secret Communist underground included an Executive Assistant to the President of the United States (Lauchlin Currie), an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Harry Dexter White), a United States Treasury attaché in China (Solomon Adler), the Director of the Office of Special

Political Affairs for the State Department (Alger Hiss), the Secretary of the International Monetary Fund (Frank Coe), a member of the National Labor Relations Board (Edwin S. Smith), Secretary of the NLRB (Nathan Witt), chief counsel, Senate Subcommittee on Civil Liberties (John J. Abt), Treasury Department representative and adviser in Financial Control Division of the North African Economic Board, in UNRRA and at meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in Moscow (Harold Glasser), Director, National Research Project of the Works Progress Administration (David Weintraub).

On the question of when the plot started, the Senators found:

The first organized subversion encountered was that accomplished by the Harold Ware underground cell of the Communist Party in the early 1930's. The subcommittee took testimony from two members of this cell. They were Whittaker Chambers and Nathaniel Weyl. In setting forth the members of the Ware cell we are listing how they testified when they were subpoenaed: Nathan Witt (invoked constitutional privilege that he could not be compelled to bear witness against himself), Lee Pressman (admitted Communist membership before House Un-American Activities Committee), John J. Abt (invoked privilege), Charles Kramer (invoked privilege), Henry H. Collins, Jr. (invoked privilege), Victor Perlo (invoked privilege), Harold Ware (deceased), Alger Hiss (denied Communist Party membership before House Un-American Activities Committee).

The report publishes for the first time part of a secret memo dated November 25, 1945, prepared by an intelligence agency of the Government, identifying other and later espionage groups. It reads in part:

The head of (one group) was N. Gregory Silvermaster, now connected with the United States Treasury. Another member is William L. Ullman, a major of the Air Force stationed at the Pentagon, who has been obtaining and photographing classified information regarding United States Government war plans and also reports of the FBI which had been furnished to G-2 of the Army. Other members of this group included A. George Silverman, a civilian employee of the War Department; Harry Dexter White, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; Lauchlin Currie, Administrative Assistant to the President, and lesser figures.

The head of the next group of Soviet espionage agents was Victor Perlo, of the War Production Board. Members of this group were introduced to (Elizabeth) Bentley at the apartment of John Abt in New York City. The individuals in this group include Charles Kramer, an investigator for Senator KILGORE's committee; Henry Magdoff, of the War Production Board; Donald Wheeler, of the Office of Strategic Services. There were various other minor Government employees in this group, including employees of the UNRRA.

On the distribution of the above 1945 secret memo, page 1 of the report says:

(It) was circulated among several key Government agencies and made available to the President of the United States.

Assessing the damage done to our country by the operation of these conspiracies, the Senators wrote:

How many priceless American secrets have been conveyed to Moscow through the tunnels of the American Communist underground will never be known.

The report uses testimony of ex-Communists to show how American policy could be influenced from a key position. Example:

Question. What you say is that (the Morgenthau plan) was a Communist plan to destroy Germany, weaken her to where she could not help us?

Answer. That is correct. She could no longer be a barrier that would protect the West * * *

Question. You say that Harry Dexter White worked on that?

Answer. And on our instructions he pushed hard.

Question. And that Mr. Morgenthau, who was Secretary of the Treasury, was used by the Communist agents to promote that plot?

Answer. I am afraid so; yes.

Question. He was unsuspectingly used?

Answer. Of course, the way the whole principle works is like dropping a pebble into a pond and the ripples spread out, and that is the way we work.

Commenting on the activities of the FBI, the report carried these lines:

(The conspirators) stayed in their jobs, received promotion, and influenced policy for several years after impressive information had been marshaled.

The FBI cannot expose and cannot force action once it has reported the results of its investigation.

There is ample evidence that the FBI and other agencies learned the underlying facts of the Communist conspiracy and time and time again performed their duty and notified the proper administrative agencies.

The Senators sought to determine precisely what aspect of the loyalty machinery failed during these former years and concluded:

Primarily, the breakdown came in the failure on the part of the responsible executive agencies to act on the information which was available.

Describing its experience with witnesses, the committee had this to report:

In public session 36 persons about whom it had substantial evidence of membership in the Communist underground in Government [were examined]. All of them invoked the fifth amendment and refused to answer questions. Many refused even to acknowledge their own signatures on official Government documents in which they had sworn to nonmembership [in the Communist Party] in the past.

All who invoked the fifth amendment were unyielding, uncooperative, and even abusive. All assumed a cloak of innocence that was inconsistent with the record and with their refusals to testify.

The record is replete with instances of identified Communists appearing who have sworn on Government applications they have never been members of the Communist Party. In many of the cases it was apparent there was false swearing when the oath was taken, but the statute of limitations provided that no action could be initiated after 3 years from that offense.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me admonish those guilty of misstatements about the 1954 campaign carefully to reread the foregoing and carefully to reread what was charged during the 1954 campaign by Vice President Nixon and others. Let them also contemplate the monstrous losses of life and substance America has suffered by reason of these recorded derelictions in dealing with the issue of communism in Government.

Advancing Activities Which Will Make Our Civilization Endure and Flourish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, many millions of dollars and much talent and shrewd organizing brains are going into the Russian propaganda drive to picture the citizens of our great country as gum-chewing, insensitive, materialistic barbarians, without souls.

It was pointed out in the report on the 14 cultural bills considered by the 83d Congress that—

One of the major ways in which we might turn reluctant and uneasy military allies—and the 800 million of uncommitted people—into friends would be to earn their respect for our own culture. It is obvious, however, that if we have no respect for and are officially indifferent to our own best cultural efforts, if we show no concern as a people and as a nation with our own contemporary culture and our living artists, then the peoples of other countries are hardly to be blamed if they ignore and underrate the cultural contributions which we have to give the peoples of the world. We have only ourselves to blame, for they take their cues from our own Federal Government. In this situation the Communist parties in the various countries and the Russians find it extremely easy to spread their lies that we are gum-chewing, insensitive, materialistic barbarians.

One place to begin righting things is in the Federal City which is singularly underprivileged regarding cultural matters as compared with other capital cities of the world and even as compared with most of the leading cities of the United States. We find W. M. Kiplinger reporting in his book, *Washington Is Like That*, published in 1942, for instance:

Despite the wealth of national tradition attached to Washington, there is very little native culture. The city has never been a notable breeding place for art, or music, or literature. Unlike other great capitals of world thought, such as prewar London and Vienna and Paris, where the native-born leaders of the cities shaped the intellectual patterns which influenced the nation, Washington as a city has no homegrown culture. Its influence in cultural matters is not by Washington, but rather via Washington. Whatever culture there is here was started elsewhere and brought in and pasted on.

Some 10 Representatives and 6 Senators joined Congressman Charles R. Howell in presenting bills in the 83d Congress for a national cultural program including a cultural center in the Nation's Capital. Hearings were held on them, but they were rejected by the majority in a report that will surely go down in history as a classic example of disinterest in the cultural heritage of the West.

In a speech to the National Symphony Orchestra Association in September 1952, when he was given a testimonial scroll calling him the most musical

President in the history of our country, former President Harry S. Truman said Washington should be developed into the greatest musical center in the history of the world. In urging an auditorium and opera house, Mr. Truman recalled that as a Senator he had twice helped to push through the Senate legislation providing such a building. But he said the bills had been murdered in the House by the efforts of lobbyists acting for cities around Washington. "They did not appreciate the fact that Washington was to be the capital of the world," he said.

Mr. Truman pointed out that he had seen show places in Mexico City, Paris, Rio de Janeiro, and he remarked:

There isn't a reason in the world why Washington shouldn't have a place where the greatest symphony in the world can play for the public.

The gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER; the gentleman from Montana, LEE METCALF; and the gentleman from Louisiana, JAMES H. MORRISON have joined me in introducing in the Congress H. R. 21, H. R. 630, H. R. 1822, and H. R. 1825, respectively—legislation "creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an inaugural hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center." Very broad support has been expressed for this legislation in principle by leaders in business, labor, education, recreation, city planning, libraries, and the fine arts generally. I cordially invite other Members of Congress, from both sides of the aisle, who may be interested in advancing the cultural status of our country, and our Nation's Capital as well, to join in sponsoring this legislation.

The bill would authorize an appropriation of \$25,000 for the commission whose members would serve without pay in considering a suitable site, procuring plans and designs, and formulating a method of financing the civic cultural center on a self-liquidating basis. The people of the District of Columbia pay more than \$170 million in Federal taxes and Congress, in its role as the City Council of Washington, should sympathetically consider the city's need for a civic and cultural center. In this connection I would like to call to your attention the following splendid editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 11, 1955:

ENCOURAGING THE ARTS

In the long view of history, a society is likely to be judged most definitively by its cultivation of the arts. American culture has frequently been criticized abroad—to a large extent unjustly and as a consequence of shrewd Soviet propaganda—as materialistic; but increasingly American artists have been making significant contributions in music, literature, drama, painting, and sculpture. What is perhaps lacking in the United States is a diffusion of the arts to the people. And it was no doubt to remedy this lack as well as to counter some of the current misconceptions about American culture that President Eisenhower promised in his state of the Union message to "recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission of the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the

Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation."

Art is never likely to flourish under governmental direction. Nothing could be further from the American tradition, or from the thought in President Eisenhower's mind, we are sure, than the kind of Commissariat of Culture which operates in the Soviet Union to make art an instrumentality of the state. Artists cannot be mobilized. But they can be encouraged by recognition and appreciation of their work; they can be stimulated by increased public understanding of the arts and by expanded opportunities for the public to see and hear their work. In the promotion of popular interest in the arts, the Government can play a most helpful role.

We hope that the President will give consideration, in this connection, to the admirable proposal put forward sometime ago in a House bill by former Representative Charles Howell for the construction of an auditorium and art center in the Nation's Capital. There could scarcely be a more appropriate beginning for a Federal program to foster interest in the arts. Creation of the means through which music, drama, and pictorial art can be brought to the people is one important contribution which can be made by government. But the sine qua non, of course, is the propagation of an atmosphere in which innovation, experimentation, and unorthodoxy can find free expression.

Pay Increase for Postal and Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, one of my first duties after taking my oath of office as a Member of the 84th Congress was to introduce a bill to increase the salaries of all postal workers and Federal employees, including those in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government, as well as those employed by the Government of the District of Columbia.

My bill provides for a pay increase of \$1,000 per annum to all such employees; those who are employed on an hourly or part-time basis are to receive additional compensation at the rate of 50 cents per hour.

Mr. Speaker, the prime justification for this measure is to compensate the postal workers and Government employees for the inadequate salaries paid them in recent years. I have maintained all along that their salaries have never been adequately adjusted to meet the high cost of living, particularly since the war in Korea. This has resulted in real losses of actual earning capacity for them and caused great hardship to many of these employees who are unable to cope with such problems as the increased cost of food, higher rents, and other essentials.

During the past few years the salaries of postal and Federal employees have lagged behind those doing comparable work in private industry. Government

employees in the lower income brackets are finding this situation almost intolerable as they struggle to maintain their family, upkeep of a household, education of their children. In many instances it was found that they had to supplement their income by part-time work outside the Government, or have their wives seek employment when they should give their full attention to the children and maintenance of the household.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues that, unlike other workers in private industry, postal and Government workers are prohibited by law from engaging in political activity in order to improve their situation. Furthermore, long before the United States Government inserted no-strike provisions in the laws affecting Federal employees, the postal workers had voluntarily relinquished all rights to declare strikes—which, as you well know, is one of labor's most potent weapons in its efforts to improve conditions for the laboring masses.

Mr. Speaker, I was extremely disappointed when the 83d Congress dragged out this issue until the very end of its second session and then adopted only a 5-percent increase in salaries, which was subsequently vetoed by the President. Surely, the 83d Congress could have taken earlier action in the matter and adopted a more adequate measure.

Postal workers and Federal employees are a conscientious and loyal group, hard working, industrious. They deserve full consideration. They deserve fair remuneration for the important services they perform to keep our Government functioning smoothly and efficiently. They should not be placed in a position of being forced to seek outside income to obtain the necessary essentials for themselves and their families. I want to stress as strongly as possible that the proposed pay increase will be used largely for meeting normal living expenses, and not for luxuries.

Mr. Speaker, we have started a new congressional session. Let us avoid the mistakes of the past by taking prompt and early action on this matter. Let it not be said of us that we ignore the postal and Federal workers whose pay increases are long overdue. Action today is worth more than all the promises for tomorrow.

Federal Regulation of Production and Gathering of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to comment concerning the fine address presented yesterday in the House by my colleague from Texas [Mr. IKARD], who speaks with authority and accuracy

in outlining the danger we are facing today in gas production. I join him in deep concern and recognize the need for legislation correcting the present interpretation of the Natural Gas Act. I wish to commend him for his presentation of the facts and his making clear the need for legislative action. I hope to join my colleague from Texas, as well as others, in this effort.

A National Materials Handling Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my remarks in behalf of my resolution proclaiming a National Materials Handling Week. Many of you may not be familiar with the term "materials handling" and what it constitutes. Actually, materials handling is just what the words mean—the handling of materials. It represents much, if not most of the physical activity in any plant. From receiving yard to shipping dock, materials are unloaded, moved, stored for minutes, moved, stored for hours or days, and moved again into manufacturing. Thereafter, they are moved from one process to the next, and so on, for 10, 20, or 100 such processes, each followed by another movement and often by one or more temporary storages. And, finally, comes movement to inspection, to storage, to shipping dock, and to common carrier, at which point they enter the distribution cycle—and that is a series of moves and waits.

The story is the same in steel mills and dairies, department stores, machine-tool plants, in arsenals and tooth-paste factories. Handling materials is a large part, if not the major part, of the activity. It is large in man-hours absorbed and large in costs hidden in such things as inventory, space utilization, output per square foot of plant, and other such measures. It is the very heart of many industries, for example, mining, and the key to superiority in others, for example, automobile manufacturing.

During World War II, men engaged in this type of work were taken from industry and placed in positions where their all-round know-how of material handling, supply, warehousing, transportation and related operation and equipment, was utilized to great advantage in the battle of the supply lines. The familiar expression "get there fustest with the mostest" is the epitome of materials handling during a national emergency. The Seabees carved the airfields out of the jungles of the Pacific Island with bulldozers, earthmovers and similar material handling devices. The derricks and cranes raised the sunken ships at Pearl Harbor; the forklift trucks moved vast mountains of materials to and from ships at dock-side operations; the tractor-trailer trains

served the bomb-loading operations at airfields. The entire supply line of our Armed Forces was dependent upon material handling and material handling devices. Anything moved in any direction, whether fluid or solid, whether the device used is a pipeline, freight car, pneumatic tube, elevator, forklift truck, or a hand truck is a material handling operation.

Great strides have been made in the last 25 years because of the developments brought forth by the material handling profession. In the constant battle against occupational hazards and diseases, material handling equipment has been the basic factor in reducing these hazards. Today one can see conveyors miles-long bringing ore, coal and slag from mines far underground to the surface without back-breaking labor. The thousands of men of yesterday, old and broken before their time by exhaustive back-breaking labor, would be amazed today at the sight of a giant forklift truck moving through a steel mill carrying an 80,000-pound coil, with one man operating it as comfortably and effortlessly as the average man operates the family car.

Better methods of material handling have greatly benefited our way of life by adding to our comfort, well-being and leisure hours. As a matter of fact, the automobile, radio, television, electric refrigerator, washing machine and the supermarket are available to every individual in this country today because better methods of handling material have made them available.

Interchangeable parts manufacturing and mass production methods were used on the Springfield rifle during the Civil War. The punch press and automatic screw machine have been in existence for many years but the greatest strides in industry were not realized until better material handling methods were devised.

It is only since World War II that the materials-handling function has begun to get needed recognition. A few companies have made real progress and are reaping the benefits, and more companies have made a good start. The first independent technical group of its kind was organized in Pittsburgh in 1945 as the Material Handling Society. Another group was organized in 1946 as the Material Handling Society of Philadelphia and in 1947 the Indiana Material Handling Society was formed.

In 1947 the Material Handling Institute, an association of equipment manufacturers, helped to organize groups in various parts of the country. In the same year independent societies were organized in Boston and Cleveland. In 1948 other societies were organized in Chicago, Toledo, Detroit, Syracuse and Houston. An organization very similar in its aims and purposes, The Society of Industrial Packaging and Material Handling Engineers was incorporated and received its charter in June 1945 in the State of Illinois. The science of packaging is important to the handling of material—consider the development of the waterproof package.

The American Society of Mechanical Engineers has a division devoted exclusively to material handling as does the

Society for the Advancement of Management.

With the increasing interest in materials handling, it became evident that a national organization composed of local chapters was needed. So in January 1949, steps were taken to form the American Material Handling Society, Inc. A charter was obtained and temporary officers were elected. The first annual meeting was held in June 1949, and the society was formally organized and chapter charters were issued in Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Houston, Indianapolis, Louisville, Pittsburgh, and Syracuse. Chapters in many other cities across the country have since been added. As a matter of fact, since 1949 the society has grown to 34 chapters in the United States from coast to coast, and 5 chapters in Canada. It is expected that with the beginning of the New Year there will be a total of 45 chapters, one of which will be in Mexico City, Mexico.

The scope of interest in materials handling is today truly international. In January 1954, the society affiliated with the Institute of Material Handling of London, England, whose membership approximates our own in size. The British society includes 88 members at large from 26 foreign countries.

The activities of the American Material Handling Society have included such things as the sponsorship of technical sessions at Material Handling Exhibitions in Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Chicago and regional conferences in every corner in the country. A national education committee and a college-industry committee cooperate with various colleges to increase the quality and scope of material handling education. For example, the New Jersey Chapter and Stevens Institute of Technology have co-sponsored a forum for the past 3 years at Stevens Institute. The society has cooperated with the armed services to develop better material handling methods and personnel has been furnished to government agencies to assist them in specific investigations.

The aims and purposes of the American Material Handling Society, Inc., include: the advancement of the theory and practice of materials handling; the promotion of the welfare and future of the profession; keeping its members in touch with materials handling information and influence not ordinarily available through their individual occupations; conducting and promoting studies of the principles governing the art and science of materials handling; publishing technical, statistical and engineering data covering all phases of the profession; determining and encouraging the formation of operating and safety codes; cooperating with other engineering societies and educational institutions in furthering the interest of the engineering profession; and establishing a better understanding of the scope of the Materials Handling Engineers' field of operation.

Because materials handling is so basic to our whole economy, the economy of the greatest manufacturing country the world has ever known, the 4,000 members of this growing society and myself urge the enactment of this special legislation

setting aside a "National Materials Handling Week", a week to pay tribute to the man who pushes the wheelbarrow and to all the men who contribute to our vast production lines. Each one of them is doing his share in making our life more comfortable and secure in peacetime and giving us greater protection in wartime.

Future of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night it was my privilege to deliver an address in Philadelphia on the subject of the Future of American Foreign Policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

It is a great privilege to speak to you in this distinguished forum.

It is a particular pleasure to share the platform with my able colleague from the State of Washington, a man young in years but broad in experience, one who has already contributed significantly to the effective functioning of the United States, the Honorable HENRY JACKSON.

It is most appropriate to consider with my colleague and with you, tonight, the future of American foreign policy as the new 84th Congress gets underway.

Here, in Philadelphia, hallowed birthplace of American liberty, we will contemplate how best we may preserve our own liberty and others' liberty throughout the world.

With the new Congress but 5 days old, we are entering into a new chapter of American history, a continuing chapter in unfolding American foreign policy.

NEED FOR BIPARTISAN TEAMWORK

The presence of my colleague here tonight, emphasizes perhaps the most important single point which I or anyone else, can make tonight. It is simply this: The success of foreign policy—now more than ever before—depends upon genuine teamwork—not lip-service teamwork between the two major political parties. I am certain that we are going to have genuine, effective teamwork.

I am certain that under the leadership of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and our able Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, that friendly constructive liaison will be maintained so that there is real consultation on the major issues involved in the future conduct of our foreign affairs.

No one here tonight need probably be told that never before has it been more important that we, as a people, be truly united at the water's edge.

In this atomic-hydrogen age, this age of jet propulsion and soon, possibly, this age of an intercontinental ballistic missile, we cannot have a "Republican foreign policy"; we cannot have a "Democratic foreign policy"; we must have an American foreign policy.

That is precisely what we are going to have.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GEORGE, CONGRESSMAN RICHARDS

We are fortunate indeed in having two statesmen on whom much of the legislative burden will fall in foreign affairs in the new Congress. I refer to the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, President pro tempore of the Senate, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the Honorable JAMES RICHARDS, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. They are men of the highest caliber. They are legislative leaders in the finest sense of the word, deeply aware of their responsibilities to their Nation.

I know, too, the other members of both the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees, and I can assure you that they, too, are deeply sensitive to their obligations to carry out a constructive foreign policy.

That is especially the case with our distinguished committee Member, our Senate minority leader, WILLIAM KNOWLAND, and it is the case with the Senate's Majority Leader Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, who has already contributed much particularly to inter-American relations.

CURRENT CHALLENGES AND PERILS

Against this background, let me say that in my judgment the outlook for our future foreign relations is bright.

To be sure, it is full of immediate challenges, full of critical dangers.

You are all aware of these perils. You are aware of the continued crisis in southeast Asia, notably in southern Vietnam.

You are aware of the nationalist ferment which is sweeping North Africa—site of several of our strategic bases—as well as the tension in many other underdeveloped areas of the world.

You are perhaps aware of recent Soviet diplomatic-economic developments with regard to Afghanistan and Finland, to cite two widely separate points, which give us cause for concern.

You are aware of the problem raised by the position of the new Japanese Government. It is a position which, I feel, in all frankness and friendship, is not sufficiently realistic about the danger of Communist aggression, the danger involved in the fake Soviet trade offensive—an offensive which is being used as a crude disguise for Soviet penetration of underarmed Japan.

DANGER OF SOVIET VERSION OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

You are aware of how significantly the Soviet Union is emphasizing the worldwide propaganda theme—the supposedly soothing lullaby—of "peaceful coexistence."

Now, by our United States definition that concept—those two words—can be sound. But, the Soviet definition of "peaceful coexistence" implies a great deal more than the ordinary definition, a great deal of which is absolutely unsound for the free world.

It implies compulsory neutralism to keep in the good graces of the Kremlin; it implies breaking up the western alliance; it implies ignoring the fact that international communism is still bent upon ruthless conquest.

No realistic power can, therefore, accept the misleading Soviet definition of peaceful coexistence with all its dangerous implications.

But, every realistic person believes we must do everything within our power to prevent a nuclear Armageddon—a terrible world war III.

War can be prevented. It will, I believe, be prevented, provided—I emphasize, provided—we are strong, provided we are prepared, provided we are united. Peaceful coexistence—yes, but only through free world strength, free world unity, free world realism.

Peaceful coexistence through actual, ironclad Soviet demonstration, for the very first time, that she means what she says and says

what she means, that is what the West must seek.

Glib Soviet promises, meaningless Soviet gestures, more Soviet soft-soap, of these we have had our fill. We are not going to heed more of the same.

We insist on hard and fast and irrevocable Soviet actions truly aimed at peace. In other words, let's see the Soviet Union agree to the sound Austrian state treaty. Let's see the Soviet Union agree to absolutely free and uncontrolled elections in East Germany and in North Korea and to an enforceable system of gradual world disarmament.

Let's see if the Soviet Union will do these or any of the other constructive deeds which she has so consistently refused.

PEACE PROGRESS EXPECTED

These, then, my friends, are some of the problems before us.

And, yet, as we review them, I am convinced that in spite of them, in the next 12 months, we are going to make further tremendous progress in helping to assure peace and prosperity. The Senate is going to ratify overwhelmingly the very helpful Southeast Asia Treaty Organization Pact. Moreover, at the meeting in Thailand late in February, I am convinced that SEATO is going to be strengthened. It must be strengthened.

We are going to ratify our mutual defense arrangement with the Republic of China.

We are going to witness final ratification of the Western European Union. Thus far, only 3 of the 14 NATO powers have ratified West Germany's admission. But, I am convinced that in spite of all the pitfalls ahead for WEU, in spite of all the roadblocks and traps which we are certain the Soviet Union will try to set in order to sabotage the setting up of the new West German Army—I am convinced that we are definitely on the high road toward the bringing into being of the Western European Union with West German membership.

I am convinced, too, that there is forthcoming new vitality in cooperation in our own Western Hemisphere and in particular in the Organization of American States. We are going to see a greater emphasis on sound inter-American relations—political, cultural, economic, defensive.

I believe, and so stated at the recent Inter-American Conference at Rio, that there is going to be far more abundant private American investment in Latin American lands. Thrilling new frontiers for the world, and particularly for these countries themselves exist in the lands below the Rio Grande. There are magnificent opportunities for growth, development, and exchange. Standards of living within the next few years are going to be tremendously raised there.

What is needed is, of course, a favorable climate for greatly expanded American and other foreign investment, and I believe that it will be forthcoming in many of these Latin countries.

GREAT PROMISE IN ATOMS-FOR-PEACE

And there is other progress that is going to be made. Few avenues offer brighter promise than the famous atoms-for-peace plan offered by President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This is one of the most dramatic, one of the most inspiring, one of the most fruitful channels of international cooperation now lying before us. It will be fruitful in the field of medicine, fruitful in the field of industrial power, fruitful in the field of overall scientific advancement, fruitful in helping to ease East-West tensions.

All this lies before us, and it is capable of realization.

So, we are moving ahead. We are doing so in spite of the pessimists, in spite of the "spreaders of gloom," in spite of some morbid people who almost seem to prefer predicting crisis rather than making realistic predictions of good things to come.

I, for one, have never believed in over-optimism, but I do believe in faith: Faith in ourselves, faith in our allies, faith in our chances for peace, faith in our Creator. And that is why I believe that we are going to continue to have a successful bipartisan foreign policy in time to come.

Let me say, too, that we are going to expand our program of technical assistance particularly in free Asia. This program, with modest expenditures, has already done incalculable good in helping to reduce illiteracy, disease, malnutrition, in helping to improve housing, sanitation, agriculture in a great many countries. I believe that this program should be expanded, not only through our own efforts, but, through the medium of the United Nations because it pays off in a thousand and one constructive ways for the good of mankind.

And, speaking of the U. N., I believe that the United States Senate will submit important suggestions for strengthening of the U. N. Charter.

I do not believe that they can or will be very radical proposed changes, but they may affect such vital matters as helping to broaden membership in the U. N., more effective Pacific settlement of disputes, and other phases which definitely do lend themselves to improvement, in spite of the possibility of Soviet veto.

This, then, is the partial shape of some of the things to come, as I see it. I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, but I believe that all that I have mentioned thus far is feasible.

Tomorrow will bring changes. The scenes on the world stage are constantly in flux. Great political personalities rise and fall, party coalitions change, circumstances unfold, new facts come to light, but these goals I have mentioned are all attainable.

In anticipating our future foreign policy goals, I should like to stress several principles which I think can be a sound guide to our action.

AMERICAN ACTIONS OBSERVED BY WORLD

The first principle which we must follow is that our own domestic actions here at home will, to a great extent, determine our success or failure abroad and that we have got to watch our step.

The eyes of the world are on America. The eyes of friends and neutrals and foes. We may, in George Washington's words, "raise a standard to which the wise and the honest may repair," or we may drag down our cause by folly and error and by being untrue to our own principles of fair play.

I must frankly state to you that the bungling initial decisions in the so-called Ladejinsky case did us no good in the eyes of the free world.

I say that any man who can win the confidence of Gen. Douglas MacArthur or that of one of my own leading colleagues like Congressman WALTER JUDG, any man with almost two decades of unblemished service is entitled to a fairer "shake" than this Government employee apparently got in the initial arbitrary handling of his case. I say to you further that certain of our immigration policies have done us little good in the eyes of the free world.

I am not of course reflecting on a blanket basis on our security program, either with respect to our own Government servants or with respect to screening would-be immigrants to our land.

On the contrary, no sensible patriotic person would want us to ignore the obvious serious security problems which we face, and which for too long, was given little consideration.

But neither would a sensible person want a security system to be distorted or mismanaged to such an extent that it harms our own country at home and abroad.

I recently released a report summarizing the candid reactions of members of our Foreign Service. That report reflected the deep concern which these patriotic men and women feel over the administration of our present security system. That does not mean that they want a single genuine security risk to tarnish the Foreign Service. But neither does it mean that they want this system to impair the effective functioning of their own Foreign Service to which they are dedicating their lives. These officials in our diplomatic corps are entitled to our respect and faith, as are the uniformed men in our armed services. Both groups are in the front lines of our worldwide defense. They are entitled to fair dealing, and I am sure that our outstanding Secretary of State, a man who has labored so long and so well for the success of our foreign policy will do everything he can to help relieve the concern in the minds of our Foreign Service workers.

PATIENCE AND JUDGMENT

2. The second principle is that we must be patient in our foreign policy dealings.

There is too much of a tendency among some Americans to want to seek a quick decision always. There is too much of a tendency in some unofficial quarters toward hasty, ill-considered impulsive action.

And let me say, there is too much of an "either/or" philosophy. "Either the Soviets do this or else. * * * " "Either an allied or neutral power does this or else. * * * "

There is too much of a tendency to ignore the fact that diplomacy is an art of patient, careful, detailed, often necessarily quiet negotiation. It consumes a great deal of time, particularly with an adversary like the Soviet Union and its satellites, as we learned at the lengthy Korean peace discussion at Panmunjom. So, we have got to get out of the immature habit of toying with "ultimatums" and arbitrary deadlines. We have got to realize that we cannot solve all our problems overnight.

In stressing this point, I am not arguing for delay or inaction or "donothingism" or weakness. On the contrary, there are issues which definitely require speed, decision, and strength and vigor of expression and action.

But, we must not assume that every single policy question lends itself to those characteristics. Our problems have been a long time in the making. They will be a long time in solving.

ALLIED TEAMWORK ESSENTIAL

3. The principle that we must bear in mind is that our strength is a team strength.

A teammate does not try to order the rest of the team, even if he is a captain. He works with his men as their equal. He is respected because of the rightness of his position, the intelligence of his decision.

We of the United States have never sought, do not now seek, a master-servant relationship with our allies. They are our sovereign equals. They are entitled to and will receive our respect and consideration.

There is too much of a tendency among some Americans to want to go off "half-cocked" every time the United Nations, or the Organization of American States, or NATO, or our partners in any of the other multilateral or bilateral groupings may not want to do something precisely as we suggest.

But, let's now act like team players and let's continue to urge our allies to do likewise.

WATCH POSSIBLE CHAIN REACTIONS

4. The fourth principle that we must follow is that we must think through our actions and ponder where our actions may lead.

There is too much of a tendency for some people to suggest some reckless action without giving the slightest thought to where that action might plunge us. The fact of the matter is that not even in nuclear

physics are there more dangerous chain reactions than in the field of diplomacy. A diplomatic decision on our part may cause reverberations throughout the world—so vast as to be almost uncontrollable.

To cite an illustration, take the instance of those who loosely suggest that today—right now—we break relations with the Soviet Union and the satellites.

Now, we keenly recognize why there is so much clamor for severance—the fact that the Soviet and satellites embassies are invariably beehives of espionage and subversion. We fully recognize the extreme difficulties which our own embassies are placed under inside the Iron Curtain and we recognize many other disadvantages of the status quo. But, the fact of the matter is that the whole world hungers for peace and diplomatic contacts for peace and symbols of the possibility of peace. There are few free powers on earth which do not want us to explore reasonable bases with the Soviet Union to try to work out an equilibrium of peace.

For us rashly and independently to sever relations would be tending almost to confirm some of the worst lies in Soviet propaganda. It would be like our saying, "we don't want to explore, we don't want to negotiate." It would tend to give unjustified credence to false Soviet propaganda to the effect that all we allegedly want to do is "to rattle atomic bombs."

Nothing could be further from the truth. No one wants peace more than we do. No one wants more than we to achieve peaceful use of the miracles of nuclear energy.

And so we should maintain our contacts, our listening posts, while protecting our own security here at home from espionage.

We must not drive the neutral powers toward the Soviet orbit by our own ill-considered action. We must impress upon the neutrals the truth that it is the Soviet Union which has consistently sabotaged all genuine diplomatic negotiations for peace, particularly by its hollow demands for phony new conferences which get nowhere.

In the spring, 30 Asian-African nations will meet in Indonesia. It is up to us to strengthen our record so that all will see that it is we, contrary to the Soviets, who are leaving no stone unturned in our efforts for peace and prosperity and security and freedom.

EVENTS COMPLEX AND INTERRELATED

The fifth principle that I want to mention is that we must realize the complexity and the interrelation of foreign events.

There is too much of a tendency to give snap reactions to particular problems on the foreign scene, as if these problems existed in isolation. A great many people who have hardly given the slightest study to certain key questions, are always offering "packaged" solutions.

Let me just mention a few key problems. Any man who thinks that any one of these problems is simple or can be solved all by itself had better go back and do some homework.

Here they are: The Cyprus question, the New Guinea question, the Morocco-Tunisia-Algeria question, the Kashmir problem, world disarmament, and the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

I could cite 20 or 30 more key problems.

But I think that you can appreciate the fact that the State Department, in seeking the solution of these problems and of the big overall problem of East-West tensions, has a tremendous job on its hands. It is a difficult, complex, detailed, challenging job.

We should first seek to understand that job, to understand these interrelated problems before we offer snap criticisms or snap solutions.

LEARN PAST LESSONS

6. The sixth and final principle that I want to mention tonight is that we have got to

learn from the past, to learn from our successes, and yes, from our failures. But we must also learn that we cannot try identically to duplicate successes under greatly dissimilar conditions.

Now, what illustrations do I have in mind?

Well, we should have learned from the lessons of Indochina that there is no country in this world which can be defended today unless a native government has the respect and eager support of its own population. No amount of foreign armies or foreign aid can hold any underdeveloped or other country unless the domestic population is eagerly committed to its own defense.

The loss of northern Vietnam was a serious loss, but what now about our successes? Well, the Marshall plan, which contributed so magnificently to the revival of western Europe, was a great success.

But for us to attempt to duplicate the Marshall plan, with its outpouring of billions of dollars in an area like southeast Asia, would be utter folly. The countries there are obviously in a different state of development than the highly industrialized countries of what was then war-ravaged western Europe. The capacity of native governments efficiently to administer aid programs is far more limited in southeast Asia. What southeast Asia needs particularly is technical assistance, greatly expanded, for improved health, improved housing, sanitation, education, administration, shelter.

Of course, they need firepower, too, defensive firepower, against the internal and external foe, and we have got to help them get it. But guns are of little use unless there is the will to shoulder them on behalf of a cause in which one truly believes.

KEEP OUT PARTISAN POLITICS

Thus, I have referred to six basic principles.

Obviously, by no means are they the only basic principles in the conduct of our foreign policy, but, at least, they may help serve as a guide to some of our future actions.

I should like to conclude with the thought that the greatest obligation upon all of us in public life is this: To think of the next generation rather than the next election.

Both parties obviously are squaring off for the 1956 Presidential election. There is nothing wrong about the two major parties laying plans so as to put their best foot forward in November 1956.

But I submit to my own party and to the Democratic Party that to put their best foot forward they must put America to the fore. The American people will continue to insist that we keep partisan politics out of foreign policy.

NEITHER PARTY IS FOR TREASON OR WAR

We can't do so if irresponsible, unfair criticism is made by one party of another party; if in ill-tempered, ill-justified zeal, one party is falsely tagged a "party of treason" or another party "a war party."

I say that both parties are patriotic; both parties are for peace. Of course, there are substantial differences within and between parties, but that is no excuse for misrepresenting the others' stand.

Let's stick to the issues. Let's get away from personalities and from false tags on people or parties. Let the facts speak for themselves. Let's fight our political campaigns far more fairly than has been occurring in some places heretofore.

The American people won't tolerate low blows. We believe in sportsmanship—in playing hard but clean—in playing to win, but not in using any foul means to do so.

And may I submit, too, that the American people will ask that all of us stand behind the great man who occupies the White House and his Secretary of State. That does not mean that there should not be intelligent

scrutiny of the administration's foreign policy actions and proposals. Obviously this Congress, or any other Congress, must fulfill its constitutional obligations, including careful review of appropriation requests and evaluating how past appropriations have been spent.

But, we have seen in certain foreign countries, notably in our long-time ally France, how the executive branch, time after time, has been paralyzed by irresponsibility and pettiness and partisan chaos in the legislative branch.

I do not want to see that recur among our French friends or, particularly, to see it happen in this country. And for the reasons which I stated earlier in this address, I definitely do not believe that it will happen here.

I do not want the legislative branch to usurp the prerogatives of the executive branch, nor the executive branch to usurp those of the legislative branch. I believe to the depth of my being in a government of checks and balances, of three separate co-equal and independent branches of Government.

I do not believe that any member of the legislative branch can or should set himself up as an omniscient alternate Secretary of State. I do not believe that any member of the legislative branch should attempt to interfere with the constitutional obligation of the Chief Executive of our land to spearhead the conduct of foreign relations.

The Founding Fathers of this Nation knew what they were doing in allocating the division of powers.

Let us oppose any move from any quarter in any party which would impair the vitality of that division of power.

In so doing, we will be adequate to the challenge of our times. We will advance the welfare of the next generation, and each of us will have made a record which will command the respect and admiration of the American electorate and most important, of our own conscience.

Thank you.

Tribute to a Mason: Dr. Abraham Shaoni, Grand Master of Masons of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Dr. Abraham Shaoni, grand master of Masons of the State of Israel, and a distinguished citizen of that country, is now visiting in the United States. On Wednesday next he is to be honored at a reception tendered to him by Benjamin Franklin Lodge, No. 50, F. A. A. M., of the District of Columbia.

On this occasion there will be present the grand master of Masons of the District of Columbia, Gregor Macpherson, who is also one of the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate, and many other Masonic dignitaries from this and other jurisdictions.

It is a pleasure to me to join in a tribute to this distinguished visitor to our shores.

Dr. Shaoni has traveled throughout Europe and the United States, gaining

friends and recognition for himself and his grand lodge. His visit to the United States is in pursuance of that objective.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief description of some of the highlights in the career of this distinguished man.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Abraham Shaoni is an attorney of scholarship and distinction who has the degree of doctor of jurisprudence. He was one of those pioneering and energetic lovers of freedom who helped found the new State of Israel. His dedication to the principles of liberty led him to an active Masonic career beginning on April 18, 1935, when he was initiated into Moriah Lodge. On February 9, 1942, he ascended to the throne of King Solomon as the 10th master of Moriah Lodge. On April 24, 1944, he was elected as grand junior deacon and as member of the Grand Lodge of Israel. On March 18, 1946, he was elected grand senior warden. On May 13, 1953, he was elected to the greatest prize that the Masonic order can bestow upon its brethren, the office of grand master.

Social-Security Benefits for Widows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest traditions of our country is the sustained concern which Americans have always shown for the protection of widows and orphans. We are proud of our record in this regard.

But, if I may so, this is an area in which our social-security system is too often discriminatory. As this law is now written, a widow is entitled to a benefit only if she is at least 65 years of age or if she has minor children in her care. Because I am convinced that the widows of this country are entitled to full survivor benefit rights, without the above restrictions, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2189 which will allow widows to collect social-security benefits whether or not they have reached the age of 65 and whether or not they have children under their care.

I wonder how often the Members of this House have had the unhappy task of explaining to widowed constituents that they will have to wait until their 65th birthday before they would be entitled to social-security benefits? How many times has the letter from a despairing widow described her tragic circumstances. Sometimes she is ill and unable to work. Sometimes she cannot find a job because of lack of work experience—for the good reason that she has spent her life in the home caring for her family. Sometimes she has managed to live for a time on accumulated savings—but has been unable to stretch those savings until her 65th birthday. Still the only answer we can make, under existing law, is to tell her she must get along somehow until she is 65.

My first consideration in introducing H. R. 2187, then, grows out of humanitarian reasons. I believe that appropriate benefits for the widows of wage earners should be part of any genuinely protective social-security system in America.

I am convinced, as well, that there are equally good reasons drawn from the cold facts of our time which call for enactment of my bill. Let me review them for you briefly.

First of all, statistics show that there is, on the average, a difference of about 3 years between the ages of husband and wife. Because wives are usually younger than their husbands the family is often, under existing law, actually removed from the social security benefit role at the time of the death of her husband. For example, if the husband is over age 65 and receiving his own retirement benefit when he dies, that benefit is stopped at the time of the widow's bereavement unless she has also reached the age of 65. In too many cases, therefore, the widow is denied a benefit at the time she most needs one—at the death of the family breadwinner.

Secondly, all studies show that the average woman is less likely to have an adequate retirement income, from any source, than are men. The median income for persons with income is substantially lower for women than for men in all age groups. More specifically to the point, perhaps, is the data assembled in a recent survey of widows receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits which showed that only 10 percent had independent money retirement income of \$1,200 or more per year. In considering my proposal, therefore, I ask you to bear in mind the evidence that roughly 9 out of 10 of the widows of workers covered by the social security system are in need of the protection of its benefits because they do not have adequate income from other sources.

We know how difficult it is for older persons with little work experience to find a job. We know that it is especially difficult for the older woman to secure any work, other than the most menial, because of the many years she has devoted to the role of wife and mother. So we surely cannot believe that widow's benefits have been withheld until the 65th birthday for the reason that, without such benefits, they could easily take care of themselves.

The only argument which has been presented to me against the proposal made in H. R. 2187 for providing benefits for all widows of insured workers, is that it would cost too much. I am informed that the level premium cost of providing such benefits would run somewhat in excess of 1 or 1 1/4 percent of payroll. If this is the case, I maintain that such costs are warranted if we propose to have a social security system which offers any kind of genuine assurance against hardship caused by the death of the family breadwinner. For my own part, I believe such added costs are more than justified in the name of the kind of protection they would furnish the wives

and mothers in our country at a time of great tragedy.

Let us remember that the breadwinner has, throughout his working life, made regular contributions toward such protection for his family. He has had no way of anticipating when and how his death would occur. Is it equitable to say to one man: "Your wife will be entitled to benefits because she is 65 years of age"—and to another, "Your wife is not entitled to benefits because she is not yet 65 years of age."

Let us remember, as well, that because of his early death the breadwinner himself will usually receive no benefits at all whereas, if he had been fortunate enough to live to a ripe old age, both he and his wife would have been receiving benefits for each month beyond their 65th birthday. For this reason, alone, it seems only just to me to make up to the bereaved wife for the benefits her husband will never receive—in spite of his payroll contributions.

I urge your support for my bill H. R. 2187 in the names of the wives and mothers of this country. Surely reasons of humanity and of equity argue for the enactment of this legislation. In my confirmed opinion, we can never feel that we have provided really genuine security against distress caused by loss of wages until we have enacted this legislation.

Sixth Anniversary of the Arrest of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following speech which I made in New York on December 26, 1954, on the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the arrest of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty:

SPEECH OF HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY, OF MICHIGAN, IN CONNECTION WITH SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF ARREST OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

I feel greatly privileged and honored to have been invited as guest speaker at the ceremonies commemorating the sixth anniversary of the arrest and imprisonment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty which took place on December 26, 1948. I am also happy to have this occasion to deliver some of my thoughts regarding the present problem which besets the Hungarian nation and all the rest of the 800 million people who today find themselves living under Communist slavery.

We have all of us seen in the papers the past few days rumors and reports emanating from Austria to the effect that the cardinal has recently been released from prison. I have been informed by official sources of our Government that there has been no confirmation or substantiation of such reports. Naturally all of us would rejoice if these rumors were found to have some basis in

fact. But lacking this, we must assume that Josef Mindszenty is still languishing in a Communist prison, in the power of the same ruthless force which seized upon his person 6 years ago today.

I well recall the events which took place in Hungary at that time so far as they were known to the general public. Most of you know that I was then in Budapest, attached to the American Legation there. Although we heard of the arrest almost as soon as it had occurred, not a word appeared in the government-controlled press until 2 days later, December 28. The brief communique from the Ministry of the Interior merely said: "Josef Mindszenty, Archbishop of Esztergom, has been arrested by police authorities under charges of low (petit) treason, conspiracy to overthrow the republic, and currency violation." The announcement must have been somewhat unexpected as only one paper, Szabad Esti Szo, commented editorially on the announcement that day. It took at least 24 hours for the rest of the Communist press to get into the act.

Many will have noted and remarked on the fact that the arrest took place on the day after Christmas, incidentally, also on a Sunday just as it is today. The explanation is, of course, due to the fact that the Communists feared to touch him before the holiday, knowing that demonstrations in his favor might have occurred on Christmas Day when millions of Hungarian Christians would be attending the church of their faith. News of the arrest, of course, did not reach the people until well after they had returned home from Sunday worship.

The story of the arrest, imprisonment, interrogation, trial, and subsequent confinement has been told and retold, and I will not further develop it here. It was my privilege to address the United States House of Representatives last February on the fifth anniversary of Mindszenty's sentencing, at which time I reviewed the facts regarding these developments as they have become known to the world outside. I think it appropriate, however, to comment briefly upon one of the cardinal's most oft-quoted remarks, an answer he so often gave to those who tried to persuade him to take refuge in the free world.

All of you have heard of this statement many times. It is very brief: "Now men are needed here."

There are with us today many persons, formerly prominent in their own occupations in Hungarian life, who have escaped from the country of their birth and have sought shelter in these United States, the traditional home of refugees and exiles even long before the time of Louis Kossuth. There is no criticism intended in my remarks for such persons, either from Hungary or from any other Iron Curtain country. They are performing a vital function here in America by their tireless efforts to keep the memory of the enslavement of their people constantly before the American public. They have also many other useful tasks to perform which they are doing ably and well. Not only their own homelands but the entire free world owes them a debt of gratitude for their work, a debt which I hope will one day be repaid in full. Such individuals are needed, and will continue to be needed.

But the human memory is of such frailty that it is not enough to need exiles and refugees. To keep the awareness of these terrible events alive in the conscience of the free world and of the slave world, we also need martyrs. Their task is immeasurably harder for in many cases they die or vanish almost unknown and unsung. But, fortunately, there are those, such as Mindszenty, whose bravery and courage is known every-

where and who will never be forgotten. We need such martyrs as examples to all of us, no matter on which side of the Curtain we live.

Cardinal Mindszenty knew he was a man in a peculiar position. He knew that at any time he could have become an exile or a refugee and continued his fight against communism from abroad. But he also knew that that was not enough, that his country and the cause of freedom everywhere needed men to remain at home, men who were willing to face the terrors of communism, men who were willing to suffer martyrdom, even of the degrading kind which he underwent. And he knew that, because of his peculiar position that his martyrdom would leave such an indelible impression on the conscience of the world that the cause of communism would be the loser thereby even though his mind would be perverted by drugs into self-confession and denial of the principles he had formerly championed. He knew that the complete contrast between Mindszenty the cardinal and Mindszenty the prisoner in the dock would be so revealing of Communist barbarities that the conscience of the free world would be aroused as perhaps nothing else could arouse it. And knowing this, he deliberately chose martyrdom, knowing that his cause, the cause of freedom, would be the stronger thereby. In such a belief, he was eminently correct.

I wish now to speak briefly to the captive peoples, not only of Hungary, but everywhere behind the Iron Curtain. Recently there has been much talk in the press of peaceful coexistence between this country and the Soviet Union. Some have interpreted such talk as an indication that we have abandoned the captive peoples to their fate, that we are willing to sit down with the Soviet ruler and divide the world into so-called spheres of influence, that we are prepared to permit the Communists to have Hungary, let us say, if they will agree to abandon their infiltrative efforts in perhaps Guatemala or Chile or Brazil. I want to answer such interpretations this afternoon.

I say to all those who hear my voice that the policy of this Government toward the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain has not changed one iota nor will it change under our present administration. Under date of December 16, merely 10 days ago, I have the following assurances from the State Department, from which I quote: "This Government is not reconciled to the present fate of those peoples; it will not be a party to any arrangement or treaty confirming or prolonging their subjection to Soviet despotism, and it seeks by peaceful means conditions permitting these enslaved national groups to recover genuine freedom and independence."

You may have heard or read of the recent speech which Secretary of States Dulles made in Chicago in which he stated, and I quote: "The scope of conferences with the Soviet Government is necessarily limited by our attitude toward the captive peoples, for the Soviets know that we will not make any deal which would condone and perpetuate the captivity of men and nations." And the State Department has personally assured me that our objective remains unchanged which is to work in all peaceful ways for the creation of a Europe in which the captive peoples will again enjoy governments as well as social and economic institutions of their own free choice.

I hope that these official statements of policy on the part of our Government will act as a reassurance to the captive peoples that they are not and will not be forgotten and that no so-called deal will be made with the Soviets that would in any sense of the word be an acceptance on our part of their conditions of bondage. Moreover, I will say

that I am convinced that the great majority of the American people are desirous and hopeful that the eventual day of liberation will come and that it will come soon.

I wish to make one thing clear about which there has been much misunderstanding. There will be no so-called war of liberation in its literal sense. The American people are not prepared and do not intend to fight a war solely and simply for the liberation of the captive peoples. The horrors of an atomic and thermonuclear war are too great for us ever to seek war of our own choosing. But if, in spite of all our efforts for peace, war should be thrust upon us we will not shrink from its horrors, however catastrophic they may be.

All the peoples of the world ardently desire peace. No one wished for peace more than Cardinal Mindszenty himself. But on the other hand we will not pay any price, however unworthy, to buy peace. And I am convinced that if war with the Soviets should come, albeit not of our choosing, we would not hesitate but would wage it until the power of international communism, everywhere, was beaten and trampled into the ground.

So, I tell you that, while there may be talk of peaceful coexistence, a concept which I personally believe can never be realized, the policy of liberation is still as much a part of our national objective as it ever was. And there are peaceful means and ways in which we can work for this liberation and I want to discuss some of them briefly.

In working for peaceful liberation, I believe we would be, in effect, working toward a victory over the Soviet Union in the only way which would avoid either shameful surrender to the Soviets or an all-out atomic war in which there would be neither victor nor vanquished. Therefore, you can see that the achievement of liberation by peaceful means would be very much in the interest of our own national security, and therefore, must of necessity be and remain a part of our Government's international policy toward the Soviets.

Before we can deal effectively with the Communists abroad, we must first settle with them here at home. There can be, and should be, no room in the United States for anyone who has sworn prime allegiance to the Soviet Union and who acts as a traitor and fifth columnist within our midst. Many effective steps have recently been taken against the American Communist Party and its members, I hope that these steps will be continued and increased to a point where communism, as an internal threat and menace, no longer exists in our midst. Outlawing of the Communist Party, expatriation and deportation of its members, Government seizure of its assets, the most ruthless steps to root out and eradicate its influence from every part of our economy and our way of life, these are some of the steps which I would suggest in the interest of our own national self-preservation. Once we have dealt effectively with the Communist menace here at home, then, and then only, can we logically turn our attention abroad.

In this connection I would hope that we use all our influence, political and economic especially, to urge our friends and allies to take similar steps against the Communist organizations in their own countries. The great worth of friendship with this country, to say nothing of military and economic assistance which may have been received from us, would not make this too unreasonable a demand on our part. But we should definitely take the leadership in this respect. We cannot, in good conscience, ask any free country to take action with regard to their own problem of domestic communism which we have been unwilling or unable to take in regard to ours.

The weapon of trade can be an important one in our hands. I have been greatly distressed recently to read that current restrictions are being loosened to permit the exportation of more and more articles behind the Iron Curtain. Excuses have been made that these are merely articles for domestic consumer consumption. But it is important to bear two theses in mind. In the first place, whatever is done to raise the standard of living of the captive people, even assuming that the average person is able to buy such consumer goods, thereby merely entrenches the Communist regime in power. In the second place, to the extent that the Soviets can import consumer goods from abroad, to that extent can they divert their industrial production from consumer to industrial and armaments production. We have had clear-cut evidence that trade embargoes have in the past seriously embarrassed and hampered the Soviet economy. I do not believe that our efforts in that direction should now be relaxed. There is no such thing in my language as a distinction between strategic and nonstrategic goods; even foodstuffs are strategic when used to the ultimate benefit of your enemy.

Legislation has been introduced into the Congress in the past and will be reintroduced in the future to provide some means of assistance and encouragement to Communist escapees, defectors, etc. Difficult as it is today, ways can still be found to cross the Iron Curtain. I am sure that the fear of insecurity and uncertainty in the free world acts as a great deterrent to the would-be refugee as do all the mines, barbed wire fences, and other physical impediments. Every encouragement should be given to those persons who defect from Soviet communism not only to benefit the acquisition of valuable information on our part but also to increase the feeling of mutual distrust that the Reds hold toward one another. Every assistance should be given to those refugees who successfully pierce the Iron Curtain with assurances of resettlement and the chance to earn a decent livelihood. As I have said before, some must remain but those who do emerge from slavery into freedom should be considered and treated as welcome immigrants, not as fugitive criminals.

In this connection, I should make particular mention of the military units which are authorized to be formed in Western Europe from among those escapees of military age. Although large sums have been appropriated for such a purpose, progress has so far been disappointingly slow. I believe the presence of so-called legions of freedom from each of the satellite countries, as well as the Soviet Union itself, in Western Europe would act as powerful magnets to draw more and more of the Communist military manpower from behind the curtain. The existence of such groups under their own national, patriotic standards could serve as rallying points for freedom-loving exiles everywhere. It should also be worthy of note that they could contribute immeasurably to the defense of free Europe itself and would thereby enable us to relieve ourselves of some of our own weighty commitments in that continent.

The shameful treaties of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam which delivered so many of the captive peoples into Soviet slavery should be carefully reviewed by our Government. It is my belief that the Soviets should be presented with an ultimatum to honor immediately the broken provisions of these treaties, especially with regard to Germany, Austria, and Poland. Should this ultimatum be rejected, I believe our Government would be completely justified in denouncing these treaties and declaring to the world that they no longer exist as far as

the United States of America is concerned. It would be my sincere hope that our British allies would feel able to join us in such a course of action.

Much has been said about the possibility of a top-level conference with the Soviet leaders in the near future. I can conceive of only one excuse for our attending such a conference and that would be to present further proof to some of our wavering allies as to the complete and utter futility of ever reaching any agreement with the present Soviet rulers. We have had too many sad experiences in the past to hope that some benefit might be derived from a new meeting. Even if a satisfactory solution to many existing problems could be reached with the Communists, what guarantee, based on the lessons of history, would we have that an agreement could or would be honored on the part of the Reds? In my opinion it is next to useless to negotiate with a government whose standards of international morality are so completely at variance with our own. The only language the present Soviet rulers appear to understand and respect is that of forceful pressure and no international meetings are needed to make use of that application.

I now come to a question which has been much debated in public circles recently and is certain to be revived again and again—the matter of severing diplomatic relations with the Soviet and satellite governments. I have recently had occasion to make some study of the reasons for which this Government refused to recognize the Soviet Union in the decade following World War I. Chief among these, of course, was the manner in which the Bolshevik minority seized power in that country and established a tyrannical government so obviously unrepresentative of the majority of the Russian people. The unmistakably amoral standards of the Soviet leaders in the conduct of international relations also played a large part. The lack of good faith, the failure to recognize normal international obligations and the noncooperativeness in regard to all forms of intercourse were also weighty considerations. But reluctant as this Government was to indicate its approval of the tyranny which had settled over the people of Russia, that in itself was not the principal reason for our failure to extend diplomatic recognition. It was rather the fact that the Soviets openly supported and directed movements of international communism everywhere which were nothing more than flagrant interferences into the internal and domestic affairs of every free country in the world, not excepting this one. It was felt that no possible indication of approval could be given such unprincipled conduct on the part of an alleged member of the family of nations.

Even after such misgivings had been overcome and diplomatic relations between the two countries had been established in November 1933, the Soviet Government merely increased its activities in this regard. The Soviet leaders themselves openly boasted of the inevitability of world revolution through the Communist fifth columns throughout the world. When they were reminded of their solemn promises in this respect and their pledges to refrain from any such activities which had been undertaken at the time of recognition, they repudiated, for all intents and purposes, such pledges by declaring that they could undertake no obligations with respect to the Communist International. Such barefaced violations of solemn international commitments very nearly caused the rupture of relations as early as 1934. Had it not been for the emergence of the Nazi menace which threatened both coun-

tries equally and forced a form of *modus vivendi*, it is probable that American-Soviet relations would have been strained to the breaking point.

Much has been made of the value of so-called listening posts provided by the American embassies and legations behind the Iron Curtain. Having served myself at one of these posts for more than 2 years, I state it as my personal opinion that such value is of extremely limited content. Much, if not all, of the information thus acquired is readily available through other sources and can hardly compensate for the intense propaganda and espionage activities carried on in this country by Soviet diplomatic officers. Further, as I have reason to know from personal experience, it is official Soviet policy to place every conceivable handicap and hindrance in the way of the operations of our Government representatives in Communist-controlled countries. The indignities and hardships, many of a personal nature, which our people are forced to undergo there are not only degrading to them as individuals but are even more degrading to the prestige and influence of this country. It must be extremely difficult for the captive peoples to retain any degree of respect or admiration for the United States when they see its servants treated with the scorn and contempt which has been the custom ever since we have been officially represented behind the Curtain.

It is my firm and sincere conviction, therefore, that a complete severance of diplomatic relations with the Soviet and satellite regimes would be one of the best steps which this Government could take to reassert its position of moral leadership of the free world. Regardless of whether or not all of our allies joined us in such action immediately, we would have asserted, not only to the free peoples but also to the captive peoples, our determination that a course of ruthless and deliberate violations of international agreements will not be endorsed by continued diplomatic recognition. Much as we dislike and disapprove of the manner in which the internal affairs of the Soviet Union are conducted, it would not be for this reason that we would take the step of breaking relations. It would rather be due to the systematic course of interference in our own domestic affairs which the Soviet Union has pursued ever since its inception.

If we are determined, as we are, to do all possible to avoid an open clash with the Soviet Union, the weapons of international morality are among the strongest which remain in our arsenal. The fullest exertion of moral force is perhaps the only way in which a change can be achieved in the present policies of international communism. No one realized this better than the man in whose honor we are gathered here this afternoon.

By his willing martyrdom, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty succeeded in rallying the moral indignation of the free world against Communist barbarity and tyranny as perhaps no other single individual has been able to do. When he was arrested and imprisoned 6 years ago today, he knew of the possibility of death, of the likelihood of degradation. Whatever his fate was to be, he faced it as bravely and courageously as the martyrs of imperial Roman times faced the lions in the amphitheater of the Colosseum. And the fate which befell him has done more to advance the cause of freedom which he so passionately and earnestly championed than any other single action on his part could possibly have accomplished.

Only the Communists know whether or not Mindszenty will ever emerge alive from his prison. Regardless of this we can only hope that somehow some word may have reached

him that his dauntless sacrifice was not in vain. But it will only continue to be of avail if the example of moral leadership and moral courage which he left us will continue to be remembered long after he is gone.

I earnestly hope that my words today will be heard in captive Hungary. To those who may receive them I urge you to carry on the spirit of moral resistance to the Communist domination which Mindszenty so splendidly typified. Your country has suffered foreign domination before, many times in its long and glorious history. But the spirit of men such as King Bela IV, John Hunyadi, Louis Kossuth, and many others always kept the flame of freedom and independence alive and Hungary always eventually threw off her foreign shackles and emerged triumphant. Josef Mindszenty now takes his place among the heroes of Hungarian history as one whose deeds and words will inspire those who survive to carry on the fight and insure that Hungary will not forever remain crushed and downtrodden. Remember the spirit of your ancestors. Remember the example of Cardinal Mindszenty. Get off your knees and hold up your heads again. *Talpra Magyar.*

And for those of us who carry on the fight in the world outside, be we Americans or Hungarians or of any other oppressed people, let us also never give up the fight against the forces of godless, totalitarian communism. Let us be firm in our faith that right and justice will one day triumph everywhere. Let us continually keep before the eyes of free peoples the plight of the captive nations and let us insure that the great examples of moral strength and courage displayed by such men as Mindszenty are never forgotten. For such an undertaking, no effort on our part is too great. We should be eternally grateful that we have men like Mindszenty who are willing to contribute so much and we should on our part be grateful that we have the opportunity to contribute our little, our bit, to bringing freedom again to the slave half of the world, to seeing that justice will again triumph and to insuring that peace will return to reign over us. May the good Lord bless and strengthen us in this, our crusade.

The President's Message on the State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement as given to the Indiana press following the state of the Union message of January 6:

I join President Eisenhower in his estimate and evaluation of the 83d Congress as expressed in his state of the Union message. I am glad to have been a Member of that body that did so much for everybody and that helped to produce the greatest prosperity that this country ever has seen, with peace at the same time.

I believe that the President will be very realistic in the matter of tariffs and the extension of reciprocal trade agreements. The industries of the United States do not ask for selfish protection but for equalization of tariff rates. It is realized that re-

ciprocal trade agreements must work two ways and that we should be entitled to the same consideration from all other nations that we, in turn, extend to them.

In regard to the spending for defense, I certainly join with President Eisenhower instead of Speaker RAYBURN. The present administration has proven that more defense can be secured for less money. Apparently, the proposal of the Democratic Party, as stated by Speaker RAYBURN at the time of his installation as Speaker, will be to spend for the sake of spending with no mention about the waste which everybody knows must be watched.

I also raise the question whether or not foreign aggression might be invited by excessive saber rattling on the part of our country or on the part of any other country. President Eisenhower has had a lifetime of experience and prefers peace prudently secured instead of aggression by provocation.

The President's concern about Communist infiltration and subversives should be shared by all. Both major political parties will do well to clean their house immediately of any extremist groups.

Eastern Orthodox Faith Preference Designation Asked for Servicemen of That Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this Congress, I introduced H. R. 581, a bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags. The bill has been referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

I was genuinely pleased to introduce this measure, the purposes of which were first brought to my attention at a banquet at Bridgeport, Conn., on Sunday, December 19, 1954. The affair was sponsored by eight Eastern Orthodox churches in the community, comprising the Carpatho-Russian, Russian, Ukrainian, Rumanian, Greek, Syrian, and Albanian nationalities. In attendance was His Eminence Archbishop Antony Bashir, Metropolitan of the Syrian Antiochian-Orthodox Church in America, who officiated at morning services signifying the founding of the new St. Nicholas Syrian Orthodox Parish, which also became affiliated with the Council of Eastern Orthodox Churches of Greater Bridgeport. The banquet also celebrated the feats of St. Nicholas, archbishop of Myra and Wonderworker.

During the program, speeches were made by the pastors of the participating churches and Mayor Jasper McLevy. Following this, there was the presentation of a resolution which was unanimously approved by the large number of persons in attendance. I then com-

mented upon the procedures that had to be followed in order to bring about the passage of a bill to accomplish the objective.

Incidentally, Rev. John Kivko, pastor of the Holy Ghost Russian Orthodox Church, informed me that he was the first chaplain of the Eastern Orthodox faith in the armed services during World War II.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the resolution as adopted. Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, introduced S. 106, a companion measure. Together, we shall request earliest possible consideration of this meritorious request.

Whereas Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL will introduce in the Senate and Congressman ANTONI N. SADLAK will introduce in the House of Representatives, in the 84th Congress, a bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith—one of the major Christian faiths in the world—as a religious preference on their identification tags:

Resolved, That the Council of Eastern Orthodox Churches of Greater Bridgeport, representing approximately 25,000 Eastern Orthodox Christians of the Albanian, Carpatho-Russian, Greek, Rumanian, Russian, Syrian, and Ukrainian nationalities:

1. Highly approves of such bill, which the council firmly believes will beneficially contribute to the spiritual welfare and morale of the many Eastern Orthodox servicemen in the Armed Forces of the United States; and
2. Strongly recommends to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress that such bill be enacted into law; and
3. That the council undertake whatever measures it may deem necessary or appropriate to lend its fullest support to the passage of such bill.

Unanimously approved by the Council of Eastern Orthodox Churches of Greater Bridgeport this 19th day of December 1954:

Rev. JOE G. SIMKO,
Chairman.
SERGEI M. GUDEN,
Vice Chairman.
JEANETTE SKIRKANISH,
Secretary.

The Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, recognizing the importance of keeping the doors to opportunity for small businesses open, are grateful for the wholehearted support for this policy given by President Eisenhower in his message on the state of the Union this January 6. It will be recalled that in his message to the joint session of the Senate and House, the President said:

The prosperity of our small business enterprises is an indispensable element in the maintenance of our economic strength. Creation of the Small Business Administra-

tion and tax laws facilitating small-business expansion are but two of the many steps this Government has taken to encourage smaller enterprises. I recommend that Congress extend the Small Business Act of 1953 now due to expire next June.

Since I had the honor of introducing into the House of Representatives the bill which finally resulted in the legislation that established the Small Business Administration, my interest in the President's message is apparent. Last week I introduced a bill, H. R. 521, to continue the SBA, which I hope this body soon will be considering, and in view of this we will want to examine the record of this Agency to consider how its services may be broadened and strengthened.

The Small Business Administration in a large measure is pioneering in a field of Government service, specializing in assistance to owners of small businesses. Obviously some time was required to staff the agency and to develop policies and programs. An examination of the record, I believe, will satisfy anyone that encouraging progress has been made. Wendell B. Barnes, the Administrator, and his coworkers have given excellent public service.

In a New Year message to all employees of the Small Business Administration, Administrator Barnes summarized results in the major programs. With the thought that Members of this body would be interested in seeing this letter from the Administrator to his coworkers as contained in Small Business Action, the agency's intraoffice information bulletin, the full text is presented to you:

ADMINISTRATOR'S NEW YEAR LETTER TO ALL EMPLOYEES

DEAR SBA COWORKER: At the opening of a new year, I would like to write you directly to thank you for your loyal and energetic work during the past year. You and your associates in the Small Business Administration have responded so promptly and energetically each time one of the Deputy Administrators or myself have called upon you for extra effort on our programs that the Agency has been able to compile a noteworthy record.

Work has been accomplished in spite of the fact that you were at times handicapped by a heavy workload and a large backlog, lack of sufficient coworkers and the fact many people could only be given temporary employment status. The extra hours that you worked and the interest you took in our programs are deeply appreciated by me and by the Deputy Administrators, office heads, and regional directors.

I know that you were pleased to hear President Eisenhower say in his message to Congress:

"The prosperity of our small-business enterprises is an indispensable element in the maintenance of our economic strength. Creation of the Small Business Administration and recently enacted tax laws facilitating small business expansion are but two of many important steps we have taken to encourage our smaller enterprises. I recommend that the Congress extend the Small Business Act of 1953 which is due to expire next June."

I am confident that the quality of your work will also be recognized by the Congress during this session, when its committees review the accomplishments of our agency.

The compiling of a good record is not the result of the work of any one office. All have contributed. An organization can operate effectively only if the mail clerks, the administrative services employees, the filing and stenographic clerks as well as the financial specialists, production specialists, and executives all do their part. That has been the situation during the past year, and the record must be considered the result of the work of each employee in the agency.

It is not possible to review in detail each of the activities, but I would like to point out to you a few of the things in which you can have a feeling of pride for having contributed your part.

CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCY IMPORTANT

The certificate of competency program of the Small Business Administration is one of the most important functions in the Agency. Through it small companies obtain prime contracts with the Department of Defense which they otherwise would be denied, due to disqualification by a procuring office regarding capacity or credit, or both.

Requests for certificates of competency are initiated by a small-business concern when its low bid on a specific procurement has been rejected by a contracting officer. The small company submits an application for certification to the Small Business Administration regional office. A careful and thorough plant survey and financial analysis are then conducted by the field engineering and financial staff. The regional report is then sent to the national office for review and evaluation. The Administrator's committee makes a final determination and recommendation as to whether the certificate of competency is to be issued.

This part of the program, namely, the processing of applications, is probably the most important single item in determining whether the certificates of competency program is to be a real help to small firms. Applications must be scrutinized with the greatest care in order to insure that only those companies that can actually produce are awarded certificates.

GOVERNMENT SAVED \$425,235.23

As of December 31, 1954, the Small Business Administration received 113 applications totaling \$25,930,957. Of this number, 53 certificates were granted, which had a value of \$6,745,610. Of these 53 cases, 15 contracts have been completed, including 8 which were completed ahead of schedule. The cumulative savings to the Government resulting from these certified contracts as of December 31, 1954, amount to \$425,235.23. These certificates all were awarded after the most careful analysis of application data, and each contractor's progress is followed closely for any situation arising where the Small Business Administration production specialists can offer technical assistance which would be helpful in completing a contract.

The majority of the cases to date have been from the Department of the Air Force, followed closely by the Department of the Army. Some of the types of military defense items procured under these certified contracts include rocket launcher assemblies, smoke generators, aircraft platform assemblies, grenade launchers, bomb slings, bomb racks, bomb trailers, boats and tents.

The certificate of competency program of the Small Business Administration has been in operation since the start of the agency in August 1953. In addition the Small Business Administration assumed the responsibility at that time for 91 active certificates of competency from its predecessor agency, the Small Defense Plants Administration. Of those 91 certificates, 21 are still in active status as of December 31, 1954. Of the 21

cases, 16 are behind schedule in their production. They are behind schedule, in spite of the fact that we have worked with the companies holding these certificates originating with SDPA just as hard as we work for those which hold our own certificates.

I do not mean to make invidious comparisons of our work with that of the Small Defense Plants Administration or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but the figures we have are the only ones available by which we can measure the work of our agency.

What do we find regarding the 53 certificates of competency issued by the Small Business Administration in the past 18 months?

SBA RECORD GOOD

Fifteen of these have been completed, including eight ahead of schedule. Twenty-seven of the contracts are active at the present time and, of these, 23 are ahead of, or right on, schedule and only four contracts are behind schedule. Contrast that with the 16 behind schedule in the inherited cases.

These figures should give assurance to the Department of Defense procurement officers that they may rely on action taken by the Small Business Administration and we, of course, should continue to regard our power to issue certificates as a serious responsibility to be exercised only when we are informed and certain of all the facts in each particular case.

Negotiations have recently been concluded with the Department of Defense making it mandatory for contracting officers to indicate those situations where a certificate of competency application would be in order.

JOINT DETERMINATION PROGRAM

Under our joint determination program with the Department of Defense more than \$360 million in Government contracts have been reserved for exclusive award to small firms. More than 2,300 individual contracts, totaling \$160 million already have been awarded to small firms as a result of representations made by employees of the Small Business Administration to the Department of Defense. The tremendous total of more than 150,000 notifications to small contract firms of Government bidding opportunities has been made by offices of our agency.

In addition each month our field offices have made approximately 1,000 referrals to small firms of opportunities for subcontracts. It is difficult to measure what this means in increased employment and greater business volume, but we can be certain that this work has kept many small firms active and in a healthy condition and has brought pay checks to many thousands of American workers.

PRODUCTS ASSISTANCE

Through our products assistance program, we have been able to assist several hundred firms which are turning from defense work to the production of civilian products and in many cases this provides as much opportunity for a small firm as does a defense contract.

PRINTED AIDS

The Small Business Administration management publications are reaching a wider circle of small businessmen each month.

By the close of 1954, 262,832 copies of the 16 titles in the small business management series, were sold by the Government Printing Office. During the past 6 months, 112,608 copies were sold. Most popular titles were "Cost Accounting," "Cutting Office Costs," and "Human Relations."

Over 1,193,000 copies of management-aid leaflets have been distributed to date, more than 900,000 of them free of cost. Of the number, 314,000 were requested during the

last 6 months of 1954. The most popular of the 57 titles are: "Loan Sources in the Federal Government," "How to Set Up Sales Territories," and "How Small Plants Can Sell to the Federal Government."

Distribution of technical aids on shop problems total 448,000 to date: 93,000 over the past 6 months. The most popular titles are "Sharpening of Drills, Lathes, Tools, and Milling Cutters," "Proper Alignment of Machine Tools," and "Precision Measurement of Work Pieces." The number of aids distributed does not tell the whole story, since many of them have been republished by trade associations, many of which regard this as one of the most helpful of our programs. Of the other publications which are sold at a small cost we have learned that more than 260,000 have been sold by the Government Printing Office and through the Department of Commerce offices. The proceeds of these sales have returned \$80,000 to the Treasury which has paid in full the cost of printing these publications.

MANAGEMENT COURSES

Following two successful experimental administrative management courses, held last spring at Richmond, Va., and University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, Wis., 35 similar courses, cosponsored by the Small Business Administration are being offered this school year by 30 educational institutions ranging from Boston to Los Angeles and Chicago to Norman, Okla.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

A year ago we had 36 financial specialists and in 3 months had approved 26 business loans and 37 disaster loans for a total of 63. We had taken action on 89 cases. Twelve months later at the close of December 1954, we had staffed our offices with 180 financial specialists and during the calendar year had taken action on 4,104 cases.

We are now administering 5,341 loans amounting to \$80,125,405. We have approved 2,091 loans, which included 1,122 business loans for a total of \$59,400,433, of which more than two-thirds are in participation with banks.

We have also approved 969 disaster loans for a total of \$5,553,834. Of the total, the remaining 3,252 are disaster loans transferred to the Small Business Administration for collection.

SOUND LOANS

One of the most significant figures indicating the quality of the loans made during the past year is the record of delinquent loans. If a loan installment is not received within 3 days of the date the installment is due, we list it as delinquent. As of December 31, 1954, only a single borrower was more than 30 days delinquent in meeting his loan installment payments.

Of course, our experience in the collection field is still brief but when one realizes that every office in the country had to cooperate to compile this fine record of loan administration, one can feel a sense of pride in the work being done by all of the other offices.

BACKLOG REDUCED

You were asked to make every effort to get the loans in from the field by December 20 in order that we could clear up the backlog during the calendar year and end with the best possible record. You will be interested to know that after the loans came in from the field, the loan examiners in Washington and the review committee worked long and hard, even during the holiday season, to complete the job.

The result is shown in the figures given above for the year 1954.

This record should be compared not with the last year of operation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, during which

many more employees were available than we have had, but with the first calendar year in which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was authorized to make business loans.

In 1935 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had 2,392 applications for business loans. In that year they approved 1,171 loan applications, of which direct loans were \$70,930,288 and the participation loans amounted to \$12,146,351.

Of course, there was no fixed limitation on the amount of loans, but it is apparent that approximately one-sixth were participation loans as compared with the two-thirds figure for the Small Business Administration loan program.

STILL ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

In reciting some of the matters about which we can take pride, I do not mean to imply that there is not still room for improvement. We are working on improvements in each of our programs and should resolve to do an even more effective job during the coming year. I ask each of you to join with me in resolving that we will find improvement and ways to increase efficiency each in his own position during the ensuing year.

In closing, I once again want to thank you and each of your coworkers for the contribution you made to the accomplishments of our agency during the year 1954.

Sincerely,

WENDELL B. BARNES,
Administrator.

No Coexistence of Religion and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 11, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal these days about coexistence of one sort or another. In the field of religion we all know that coexistence with communism is impossible because of the godless philosophy of communism.

This was the theme of my address last Sunday, January 9, 1955, at the Holy Family Church in my district in Brooklyn, popularly known as the Slovak Church, which is celebrating the 50th anniversary of its founding. I was privileged to be the guest speaker at this celebration, over which Auxiliary Bishop Raymond A. Kearney presided.

The text of my address follows:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, ON SUNDAY, JANUARY 9, 1955, IN CELEBRATION OF 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SLOVAK CHURCH

My fellow Americans, it is impossible for me—a Member of the Congress of the United States—to face this devoutly religious audience in this safe and free environment, and close my mind to the outrages that are being perpetrated, even as I speak, against the religious spirit of man wherever communism holds sway. For me the significance of the event we celebrate today—the 50th anniversary of this church—is symbolic of the eternal victory of the Christian Church that was born on the Rock of Peter. It is a manifestation of the challenge of the faithful to the enemies of Christendom, whose

brutal strength in our day derives from the Communist total state. We here at this hour, in this church, in this community, are but a fragment—but I hope a potent one—of a monumental and historic world struggle. My assignment today in this celebration limits me to but a moment, and yet that moment will be rich in fruitfulness for the free religious world if I can associate this event, local as it is, with the holy cause into which world affairs have swept us all.

The cause of which I speak has to do with the religious soul of man and is not—for the moment—concerned with territorial aggression as such, with political or with economic considerations. And in that sphere—as perhaps in all spheres—let me make it plain, there can never be any coexistence of any kind, in any way, between the free and the slave world. The Communists themselves have thrown the gantlet into the face of God. Kopecky, the Iron Curtain's Minister of Information in Czechoslovakia, said in July 1952: "People who go to church demonstrate their opposition to the people's democracy" (people's democracy is their word for the total state). He goes on: "They gain courage in church to invoke American imperialism." "In the struggle against such enemies," says Kopecky, "we stop at nothing." Stalin put it just as baldly: "Communism," he said, "will agitate against both Catholicism and Protestantism, and against orthodoxy in order to bring about the triumph of the socialistic-world outlook."

To me, this church is one of the millions of fortresses against these openly declared enemies of God. I will not distress you with the antireligious tortures and the massacres and the purges, the confiscation of church property, and the deliberate, cunningly contrived misuse of the church itself, as an instrument of the total state. You know the cruelties that have been perpetrated upon Mindszenty in Hungary, upon Budkiewicz and Wyszynski in Poland, and upon saintly Slovak churchmen and Catholics generally beyond counting; in Czechoslovakia where the Catholics constitute 10 million out of a population of 12 million. Our job here is as plain as day. We must strengthen ourselves in our own faith. We must assure this religious edifice an enduring and a vital place as a voice in support of spiritual growth and freedom. The Slovak people have a long tradition of progress in architecture, in music, in literature, with which the whole of western civilization has enriched itself. And the very fiber and sinew of this great tradition of culture is the Catholic faith of the Slovak people.

The people of the Slovak racial strain are no newcomers to the struggle for liberty. When Czechoslovakia won its independence after the First World War, that struggle was part of a story that goes back to the Middle Ages, back to the ninth century even and to the great Moravian Empire. Masaryk and Benes carried in their hearts the fire of the ancients. You who know so well the story of Czechoslovakia's fight for independence in our own time, know also that much of the struggle was carried on here on this free American soil, so hospitable to human liberty everywhere. I urge you in the same way to let this church serve as a base for the strengthening of the faith. By paths that you know better than I, you must help the people of your racial strain in Czechoslovakia to surmount the crisis that now confronts them. They must feel confidence in your devotion to the altar of God at which in your hearts you both pray—you in freedom, they in slavery.

I hold that the degree of your devotion to the Roman Catholic faith is the degree of your weight and your valor in the fight against communism as, indeed, I believe it to

be the degree of your faith in your country and your patriotism. For the 50 years of the existence of this church community are integrated into the 2,000 years of the existence of the Roman Catholic faith. And the Roman Catholic faith is beyond all peradventure of a doubt the most formidable weapon spiritually against the great anti-religious conspiracy of communism. It is this conspiracy, which is indigenous to communism and to the total state, that points up the basic struggle between communism and religion. It makes what is called coexistence spiritually as impossible as it is incomprehensible. Communism and the church must remain forever mutually antagonistic.

To put it in a word, communism—now that nazism has been whipped—is today's embodiment of the total state. It coils its poisonous tentacles from its center in the Kremlin beyond the borders of the Soviet Union into the heartland of Europe and the Far East. It represents a clear and present danger to civilization itself. This danger goes to the very roots of life. It is political. It is geographical. It is economic. It is personal. It affects every department of living.

For us the danger is above all—spiritual.

In our form of government there is no conflict between God and loyalty to country. Our literature is replete with such expressions as "This Nation under God." The two—God and country—represent an amalgam of the spiritual and the political. Our system of government accepts the supremacy of God. The Soviet state does not. There is the underlying difference.

You can divide geographically. You can share economically. You can endure politically. But no system has yet been devised for cutting the human soul in twain and making it serve two masters. Our soul belongs to God—and only to God. The total state is the absolute state. It has no room for God. It cannot share its monolithic authority with any other institution. Its basic credo forbids it to accept the supremacy of the people in government or the principle of obedience to God. With diabolical cunning—especially in recent months—it seeks to subvert religion and God to a position of subordination to the state. By raw tyranny, by defection, it is reducing religion to the position of serving as a creature and utensil of the state.

This is the most wicked element of all in the total fraud that is the total state.

This calls for war against a devastating enemy on the spiritual plane.

In such a spiritual war none of us can afford to rest.

It is a war that will have to be fought in the Halls of the Congress of the United States. It will have to be fought—as indeed in many ways it is being fought—in the United Nations.

It will have to be fought—and the campaign will have to be sustained—in institutions like this church. By giving voice to your faith, by meeting the crisis when the hour of decision arrives, by offering succor to your friends and relatives abroad, you will, all of you—perhaps in our own time—bring about the doom of the enemies of God. You who are so loyally American and have contributed so much in life, in treasure, in culture, to the upbuilding of this country, will serve its free institutions best by giving yourselves to your God and your country in the next 50 years as you and your forebears gave yourselves in the 50 years we celebrate today.

We who have faith know that regardless of its temporary gains communism will be eventually defeated and destroyed because of its godless philosophy.